

Oct.

medicine
more than
god. We
which as-
er it, and
expected
arrange-
trace the
sequence,
medicine.
ns as to
l investi-
o a wide

nd which
wonder.
a field of
medical
and yet
yed more
omitted.

rested in
means of
x?

pace, and
the work.
defence
ho have
no, the
The style
cal than
n under-
ohnson's

be that
nclosure
erm 'cir-
ovement
the term
nation of
ntion of
roni the

n which
Genoa,
y. Dr.
a claim
tements

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o XXX. JANUARY 1883.

ART. I.—PUSEY'S S. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA.¹

S. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria: Five Tomes against Nestorius, Scholia on the Incarnation, &c. (Oxford, 1881.)

THIS volume has a full share of the melancholy interest which attaches to posthumous publications. It consists, for the most part, of the last contribution made by Mr. Philip E. Pusey to the cause of patristic literature. When his life was closed by a sudden seizure at the age of forty-nine, in January 1880, those who knew anything of him must have felt that he had also contributed more than he knew of to a cause which lay yet closer to his heart, the cause of Christian edification.

The retrospect of that life, to the outer eye so clogged and overshadowed, is in one view deeply pathetic, in another at once admonitory and inspiring. Deaf and crippled from early childhood, and debarred by his infirmities from the career and from the society of his equals, he might have been expected to drift into an invalid's habits of self-indulgence, content with just as much of intellectual exertion as might best beguile the weary days. But Philip Pusey had inherited no small share of his father's extraordinary energy of will, and had profited by the constant example of that father's supreme singleness of heart. He became himself, without in the least intending it, an example not only to sufferers, but to students. We venture to quote from some notes taken at the time of a sermon preached by Dean Liddell in Christ Church Cathedral, three days after Mr. Pusey's death. After alluding to 'the small emaciated form which all had seen swinging itself on

¹ [It is necessary to state that this paper was not only written, but in type, before the lamented death of Dr. Pusey.—ED.]

crutches up the steps of the quadrangle, or along the street, with such activity,' and adding 'Few of you knew what gentleness, cheerfulness, and activity dwelt in that frail tenement,' the Dean told how, wherever Philip Pusey had travelled in the course of his literary labours—of which more presently—he had 'won hearts by his simple engaging manner, and by the courage which was combined with his helplessness,' insomuch that 'the monks of Mount Athos had asked an Oxford visitor, *And how is Philippos?*'¹ What significance in that simple question! He went on to speak of 'the pleasant smile with which Philip had been wont to greet his friends, his courageous patience under life-long suffering, and what seemed in him an incapacity of complaining; his delight in children—the sure sign of an innocent and happy temper; his awe and reverence for Almighty God, and constant desire to obey and please Him. When it was made plain to him that he could not take Holy Orders, he only said that his one wish was to do whatever he was told would best promote the service of God, as he could, and when, and where.'

Piety, in the most comprehensive sense, was indeed the motive power of Philip Pusey's life, and the source of all his strength, active or passive. For him the Fifth Commandment was linked most closely to the First. The profound adoring earnestness with which he would mentally follow the Cathedral services, of which he could not distinctly hear a word, was of a piece with the beautiful devotedness which made him accept absolutely his father's directions as to the line in which he was to work for Him whom, in the notes to his volume, he repeatedly calls 'our Master.' Those directions will be best appreciated by turning back to a passage in Dr. Pusey's famous sermon on 'The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent,' preached in 1843, wherein he adduces 'the words of a father who, in warfare with the Nestorian heresy, lived in the mystery of the Incarnation,' *i.e.* an extract from *S. Cyril of Alexandria's* comment on *S. John* vi. 53. With this let us compare Dr. Pusey's touching words at the end of the Preface to the present volume, dated 'Christmas Eve, 1881.'

'*S. Cyril* was my own early teacher on the connection of the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Holy Eucharist, which Hooker

¹ We believe that the question, as put to a distinguished Oxford tutor, who has travelled much in the East, was, '*And how is Philippos of London?*'—London being, to the good monks, synonymous with England.

all but reached.' (The allusion is to *E. P.* v. 56. 9.) 'It was at my wish that, in his uniform filial love, my son took as the central work of his life, to make the text of his works as exact as it could be made. For this he visited libraries in France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Russia, Mount Athos, Cairo, Mount Sinai; and applied to this the knowledge of Syriac which he had perfected in view of another object which I had suggested to him, the re-editing of that now much undervalued critical authority, the Peshito. Almighty God was pleased to break off the work "in the midst of the years."

Not long before Mr. Pusey's death, he had told a friend of the present writer that he had work before him for fifteen years if he should live so long. He had edited, first, *S. Cyril's Commentary on the Twelve (Minor) Prophets*—taking this at the outset, as ancillary to the work which his father was then completing on the same subject; otherwise he would surely have begun with the *Thesaurus*, or the Treatise against Julian. In the preparation of this edition he made a journey to the East; and, as he tells us in the Preface, 'of the nineteen monasteries on Mount Athos he visited all in which he had any reason to expect to find Greek MSS.' 'In the Monastery of Sphigmenius,' he adds with quiet humour, 'if there was a library, I could not see it.'

He was hospitably entertained at Moscow, by order of the venerable metropolitan Philaret, for more than a month; and in the West he found a helpful welcome at Milan, Madrid, and elsewhere. The two volumes were published in 1868, and dedicated with simple emphasis '*Patri Meo*.' He next undertook *S. Cyril's Commentary on S. John's Gospel*, which he published with certain other small works and fragments of works, making up three volumes, in 1872. The fragments were from *S. Cyril's* works against Diodore and Theodore, and against the '*Synousiastæ*' or Apollinarians; and, as Dr. Pusey says in the Preface to the present volume, were 'collected with great pains from every source hitherto known, including a MS. "Defence of the Council of Chalcedon, by John, Bishop of Cæsarea," still extant in MS. in Syriac and in Greek, at Venice and at Cairo, where my son saw it. This collection of fragments is the completest collection extant' (Preface, p. civ). The Latin prefaces to both these portions of the projected complete collection of *S. Cyril's* text conclude with expressions of devout thankfulness for the Divine protection and preservation. Soon after the appearance of the *Commentary on S. John*, Mr. Pusey published in pamphlet form, 'for the use of the Theological School' of Oxford, what he designated *The Three Epistles of S. Cyril*, meaning the

second and third Epistles to Nestorius and the Epistle to John of Antioch (commonly called *Lætentur cæli*), 'with revised text and English translation.' They were re-issued together with the *Libri Quinque contra Nestorium*, the *Explanatio XII Capitulorum*, the two *Defensiones Capitulum*, and the *Scholia de Incarnatione*, in 1875, which were followed in 1877 by the *De Recta Fide ad Theodosium*, the *Dialogus de Incarnatione*, the *De Recta Fide ad Arcadium Marinamque*, the *De Recta Fide ad Pulcheriam et Eudociam*, the *Dialogus Quod Unus sit Christus*, and the *Apologeticus ad Theodosium*. A volume of the 'Library of the Fathers' had already appeared in 1874, containing part of S. Cyril's commentary on S. John in an English dress, with a preface to which Dr. Pusey himself contributed the largest part, on the great question of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son.

The present volume, also included in the same Library, and published forty-three years after its commencement, consists of an English version of the *Five Tomes against Nestorius*, the *Scholia*, the *Christ is One*, and the Fragments against Diodore, Theodore, and the Synousiasts or Apollinarians, together with a Preface which Mr. Pusey apparently had not time to finish, and to which Dr. Pusey has added a lengthy supplement.

To a Preface thus composed the attention of readers will naturally be directed, when they first take up Mr. Pusey's last volume on S. Cyril. And we must in the first place ask them to observe that, considering the circumstances which we have mentioned, it is but natural that the name of S. Cyril of Alexandria should be invested in Dr. Pusey's mind with specially tender and sacred associations; that he should feel towards him, in short, a kind of personal loyalty, distinct from the affectionate reverence which he would entertain, for instance, towards S. Athanasius, or S. Chrysostom, or S. Augustine. And, this being so, it could hardly surprise us if he were to avert his eyes as much as possible from certain points in the public conduct of his 'early benefactor' (Pref. p. cv), and to insist that this or that questionable step must have been right, because, in fact, it was taken; if, in a word, he were instinctively led on from doing due homage to a great Catholic Doctor into idealizing his character as conspicuously that of a Saint.

Now, we have the fullest conviction that Cyril's memory has been much wronged by writers of the modern liberal school.¹

¹ A reviewer of Milman in the *Christian Remembrancer*, Oct. 1854, says of him and of similar writers: 'If there are manifest faults of character in

It was comparatively little that they should not appreciate his eminence as a divine, or the great services which he rendered to Catholic Christianity. This was to be expected, of course. But besides this, they have exaggerated the faults of his public conduct, and ignored not only his high courage and his majestic force of character, but also his firm grasp of the Christian ideas of mediation and atonement, and that deep religious sense of 'the marvellous love of God, as manifested in the Incarnation,' which, as Dorner admits, was a sustaining motive of his polemical energy. Herein they have supplied another illustration of that *odium anti-theologicum* which, when excited by the names of certain famous hierarchs, goes far to contradict all professions of tolerance or charity. But then, if we were asked what was most likely to provoke an access of this unfairness, we should be obliged to answer, 'Indiscriminate eulogy—a disposition to look at Cyril from the hagiological rather than the historical standpoint.' And we fear it must be admitted that the preface before us goes some way in that direction. Dr. Pusey, indeed, in his own part of it, says that during several months in 430 Cyril 'waited,' having 'learned probably from his fiery adhesion to his uncle and early benefactor Theophilus, and its injustice to the memory of S. Chrysostom:' words which give but an inadequate conception of the deplorable letter to Atticus, wherein the young 'Pope' of Alexandria ranked the glorious confessor of Constantinople with Jeconiah, and even with Judas, by way of emphasizing his refusal to place the name of 'John' on the diptychs of his church, as a bishop who had died in Catholic communion.¹ Ere long, it is true, he yielded to circumstances, and to Isidore's exhortation not to imitate his uncle, nor perpetuate an ecclesiastical feud under the garb of piety.² And in the February of 430 he referred to 'John' as a standard of 'fluency' which, he intimated, Nestorius had still to reach.³ But it is hard to believe that he had really come to a better mind on the merits of the case, since we find him, in 432, praising Acacius

any one, his earnestness for religious doctrine is at once condemned as a mere excuse for personal quarrels or party aggrandisement; and, as in S. Cyril of Alexandria, no language of reproach appears too stern.' He 'is treated with uniform unmitigated severity.'

¹ See Aubert's *Cyrl*, v. par. i. *Epist.* p. 206.

² Isid. Pelus. *Epist.* i. 370. Compare Photius, *Bibl.* 232. 'He [Stephen Gobar] states what sort of opinion the most pious Isidore of Pelusium had about Theophilus and Cyril, . . . how he spoke ill of them, because of their enmity to Chrysostom,' &c.

³ *Epistles*, p. 34.

of Berrhoea,¹ S. Chrysostom's one surviving personal enemy, for a speech uttered by him in Cyril's own hearing, 'when John was accused at the Holy Council of the Oak.'² But there is something else to be taken account of in any full estimate of Cyril's character, of what he had had to learn and to unlearn. To this Mr. Pusey has referred in p. ix of the preface, as follows:—

'S. Cyril's accession to the archiepiscopal throne of Alexandria brought him at once into a position of great power in Alexandria; and brought too, in the early part of it, trials in regard of the disunion between him and Orestes, the governor, resulting from the Jewish insurrection against the Christians.'

Nothing but absolute hero-worship could have led Mr. Pusey to give this extraordinarily euphemistic summary of transactions which have become more widely known than many others in Cyril's life. We hardly need remind our readers that the prefect of Egypt had long been offended, as Dr. Neale says,³ 'at the enormous power assumed by the bishop,' who had begun, in Socrates' words, to 'go beyond the bounds of ecclesiastical administration, and to domineer in civil affairs.'⁴ Cardinal Newman, in the wonderfully vivid paper on Theodoret which appears in his *Historical Sketches*, says that the power of the Evangelical See was 'too great for human nature in times of external prosperity and in ordinary hands;' that Athanasius was intrinsically too noble 'to abuse his power;' but that 'when he was gone, and persecution ceased, and his place was filled by men of coarser grain,' it was otherwise. 'Scoundrel'⁵ as Orestes probably was, we can see that he had his own reasons, such as they were, for wishing to force a quarrel on Cyril. He listened to Jewish maligners, and caused a zealous lay churchman to be scourged. Cyril threatened the chief men of the Jews; and they in revenge planned a night-attack on the Christians, which was only too successful. Thereupon Cyril, doubtless despairing of justice from the prefect, took the law into his own hands, led his adherents in force against the synagogues, drove the Jews out of the city, and gave up their houses to

¹ Of him Cardinal Newman writes: 'What is so dreadful to look upon as a hard-hearted old man?' *Hist. Sketches*, iii. 346.

² Mansi, v. 833.

³ *Hist. Patr. Alex.* i. 226.

⁴ Soc. vii. 7.

⁵ It is Kingsley's word, in *Hyppatia*, c. 20. Speaking of the rotten state of society in Alexandria, he says that moderns know as little of the pandemonium against which Cyril fought, as they do of the intense belief which sustained him in his warfare.

be plundered by the mob. Soon afterwards, acting on good advice, he attempted to be reconciled to Orestes, who, however, preferred to keep his grievance, and was obdurate. Then the Nitrian monks, among whom Cyril had been brought up, hurried in wild excitement to Alexandria, and one of them wounded the governor with a stone. 'The culprit,' says Neale, 'was arrested, condemned, and executed' by torture; whereupon Cyril proclaimed him to be a martyr, although ere long he 'was glad to let this monstrous canonization sink into oblivion.' Must we go on to the tragedy of Hypatia? It is indeed most unfair to fasten on Cyril personally the guilt of that hideous murder, which Kingsley has so piercingly described.¹ What Socrates says is, 'This brought no small disgrace on Cyril and on the church of Alexandria.'² The statement of the Pagan Damascius in the next century, to the effect that the Archbishop had prompted the deed, is unsupported, and evidently calumnious. But Cyril was responsible for having stirred up 'a force of passions which outran his own control.' His had been the error of thinking that in her strife with the world the Church must not disdain the world's weapons; and 'those who had shed Hypatia's blood at the foot of the altar were but bettering the instruction which had let them loose upon the synagogues.'³ These are not matters to be disposed of under such a phrase as 'trials,' as if Cyril had been in 414-5 simply the meek victim of the spite of Orestes or of the Jews. Of course the events in question constituted a 'trial' for Cyril; but the point is, how did he stand it? What Cardinal Newman says of his persistent hostility to S. Chrysostom's memory may be applied with yet greater force to the line which he took in the other case:—

'It is not honest to distort history for the sake of some gratuitous theory. Theologically he is great; in this respect Catholics of all succeeding times have been his debtors . . . but . . . we may hold S. Cyril to be a great servant of God, without considering ourselves obliged to defend certain passages of his ecclesiastical career. It does not answer to call whitey-brown white.'⁴

'Accept no person against thy soul, and let not the reverence of any man cause thee to fall.'⁵ One who is

¹ *Hypatia*, c. 29.

² Soc. vii. 15. Stanley says, 'The direct charge of Damascius is not contradicted by Socrates' (*East. Church*, p. 293), as if Socrates could have read Damascius; and thence he infers that 'Cyril was suspected, even by the orthodox, of complicity in the murder.' Even Milman does not go this length (*Lat. Christ.* i. 191).

³ *Dict. Chr. Biog.* i. 764.

⁴ *Historical Sketches*, iii. 342.

⁵ *Ecclus.* iv. 22.

more inclined by habit to admire than to criticize should keep this maxim before him written large, when he has to speak of certain canonized Fathers—of Cyril, of Jerome, or even of Leo. He will then remember that his first duty is not to their honour, but to historical truth and the Christian moral standard; and he will not let the saintly prefix pervert his judgment on a question of right and wrong. When he comes across what is wrong in their recorded conduct, he will speak of it gravely, and as it were sorrowfully, with careful measurement of words, and with scrupulous appreciation of temperament, of difficulties, of provocations, and of counter-balancing merits. But he will not try to make it look like right, or to wrap it up so as to keep it from recognition, or even to omit it from a general estimate of character. Doubtless it was possible that the 'high-handed proceedings' of Cyril's early episcopate should leave no permanent mark upon his character; that within thirteen or fifteen years he should have so completely overcome the habits of his early training and the tendencies of his natural disposition as to be simply the loving, 'peace-making,' 'self-forgetting,' 'God-devoted' saint presented to us by Dr. Pusey's fervent affection. It was possible; but, on the whole, was it probable? and do all the facts verify this engaging picture?¹ That he was a man of 'strong natural love' for friends and adherents, as Dr. Pusey infers from one of his letters to Acacius of Melitene, proves too little. If we love those who love us and are loyal to us, what thank have we? Again, did Isidore, who knew Cyril intimately, and whom Cyril called his 'father,' think in 431, while the Council of Ephesus was sitting, that his 'son' and 'Pope' had been thoroughly softened and disciplined? He did not; for otherwise he would not have warned Cyril that if 'prejudice could not see clearly, antipathy could not see at all;' adding that 'many who were assembled at Ephesus charged him with prosecuting a private quarrel,' and observed, 'After all, he is Theophilus' own nephew.'² Dr. Pusey quotes this letter, but endeavours to break its force by setting it in parallel with another letter of subsequent date, wherein Isidore told Cyril that his acceptance of the Formulary of Reunion proved him to be 'either unstable or insincere.'³ But are the cases analogous? The second letter deals with the question of the consistency of certain

¹ Garnier admits that 'his temper, unless restrained by the bridle of Christian virtue, was *almost ambitious*,' and that 'even his sermons seemed sometimes *vix non iracundia accendi*' (Mar. Merc. *Op.* ii. p. xiii).

² Isid. *Epist.* i. 310.

³ *Ib.* i. 324.

theological statements, as to which the great abbot's *prima facie* view might be mistaken. The first is evidently prompted by anxiety as to the revival of dangerous impulses in Cyril's nature, which his spiritual 'father' knew too well. We do not say that this warning was needed; but it is too plain for question that Isidore thought it was, and that, as he had said in an earlier letter of rebuke, 'he must not be like Eli.'¹

At the same time, it is certain that Cyril showed nothing like impetuosity in, at any rate, his earlier proceedings towards Nestorius. He was altogether within his rights, nay, he was but doing his plain duty,² when in April of 429 he warned the monks of Egypt against errors disseminated from Constantinople, without naming Nestorius as the author of the sermons³ which contained them. His first letter to Nestorius, after that prelate had taken offence at the 'Epistle to the Monks,' is grave and earnest, but not bitter;⁴ it intimates some doubt as to whether the obnoxious writings were really by Nestorius, and assumes nothing to be his act but the rejection of the word 'Theotocos,' a rejection which he is entreated to cancel, and thereby to consult his own reputation, and to secure Christian peace. Nor does the inestimable 'second letter to Nestorius'⁵ contain a harsh or unbrotherly word. Cyril writes, he says, 'out of love in Christ,' and he explicitly guards his statement of doctrine from any appearance of the Apollinarianism with which Nestorius charged the maintainers of 'Theotocos.' The letter was apparently written at the end of January 430;⁶ and after Easter Cyril

¹ Isid. *Epist.* i. 370.

² See S. Cyril *Epist.* p. 30.

³ The first of these sermons, which begins, 'The doctrine of piety,' and was preached at the end of 428, exists in Mercator, according to both Garnier and Baluze. It attacks the term 'Theotocos,' and uses 'incarnation' in the sense of an association between the Word and a man who was His instrument (comp. Cyril. *Ad Monachos*, c. 21), and who is said to be adorable for His sake. Garnier pieces together some fragments into what he ranks Nestorius' second sermon, preached very early in 429. To one of these passages Cyril clearly alludes in *Ad Monachos*, c. 10. A third sermon of the same date, as given by Garnier, seems referred to in *Ad Monachos*, c. 9, 12.

⁴ Neale indeed says, 'that it shows somewhat of the same spirit which had led Cyril to the vehemence displayed by him in his youth.'—*Hist. Alex.* i. 246. But this is rather too severe. See the letter in S. Cyril's *Epist.* p. 19, or Mansi, *Concil.* iv. 884.

⁵ S. Cyril's *Epist.* p. 22, or P. Pusey's edit. of S. Cyril, *Op.* vi. 2.

⁶ See Garnier, ii. 45. Mr. Pusey says, we know not why, 'that it was probably written before the close of 429.' We may here add that there seems to be an oversight in Pref. p. xxi, where a long extract from Nestorius (see it in Mansi, v. 761) accusing Cyril of garbling is prefaced by 'The passages of the letter to the monks referred to by Nestorius

wrote to Celestine of Rome, taking credit for his own patience, but indicating somewhat of the old Alexandrian jealousy as to the power of the comparatively upstart see of Constantinople.¹ This letter produced in August the synodical inquiry at Rome; after which Celestine commissioned Cyril to excommunicate Nestorius, unless within ten days he should agree with Rome and Alexandria 'as to the birth of Christ our God.' But it was not until the beginning of November that Cyril acted on this commission by sending the 'third letter to Nestorius,' with its accompanying anathematisms; so that Neale is warranted in saying that 'none can justly accuse Cyril of eagerness in procuring the downfall of his opponents but such as, to carry out their own preconceived hypothesis, dare to violate all truth, and to reject all testimony.'² Yet can we think that in proposing to Nestorius, as a *sine qua non* of communion, the adoption of these anathematisms, which Mr. Pusey again translates in his portion of the Preface, Cyril was doing precisely the best for the cause which he had so deeply at heart? To us it appears that he was not. The twelve 'articles' or 'chapters' in themselves were by no means calculated to reclaim the erring prelate, being aimed expressly and pointedly at language which he had used;³ and the abruptness of their tone, and a certain onesidedness which laid them open to criticism on the part of many who believed in a Divine Christ, but were jealous for the truth of His Humanity, were 'obstacles to their acceptance,'⁴ and a source of manifold confusion and discord. The all-sufficient proof of this is, that Cyril found it necessary to explain and to re-explain them, and that they

are,' &c. Nestorius is here complaining of the mode in which extracts were made from his sermons for Celestine's information in the spring of 430. On this point, see Tillemont, xiv. 346.

¹ Mr. Pusey says (Pref. p. xix), that 'there was still at Constantinople habitual soreness towards Alexandria.' Was not this soreness reciprocal? Garnier, as we have seen, thought so.

² Neale, i. 251.

³ Thus in the letter the crucial term 'Theotocos' is reserved for the eleventh chapter, the way having been carefully prepared for it, whereas it is thrust forward in the second clause of the first 'article' or 'chapter' or anathematism.

⁴ *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* i. 766. Dr. Pusey thinks their language 'so clear' as to make any misunderstanding a matter of wonder: but onesidedness is always open to misunderstanding. *E.g.*, they say nothing of the impassibility of the Word *as God*; nor do they, like the Formulary of Reunion (which, as we shall see, was not of Cyril's writing), set the 'Manhood' in parallel with the 'Godhead.' Undoubtedly, as Cyril explained them, they are an orthodox expression of one aspect of the Incarnation, and they give intimations of the other aspect.

rece
Eph
soon
ther
say
epis
read
bear
was
neces
our
to s
tain
shou
Nes
but
writ
Nes
dema
cons

rega
arriv

Gen
Cele
sent
obey
not
rate
Eph
the
them
been
Bish
and
of a
the C
bish
that

1
2
3
P. 10
4

received at most a tacit acquiescence in the Council of Ephesus, and were passed over by the Council of Chalcedon,¹ soon after which a Patriarch of Constantinople denounced them with almost inarticulate fury.² It is very well to say that they ought not to have been circulated without the epistle to which they were annexed, and which, if carefully read, would have corrected any misconception as to their bearing; but it was to them, not to the letter, that Nestorius was imperatively summoned to set his hand. 'What it is necessary for your Piety to anathematize is subjoined to this our letter.' And when Dr. Pusey adduces a letter of Cyril's to some of his own clergy resident at Constantinople as containing a 'frank offer' of peace, on condition that Nestorius should write a statement of 'Catholic faith,' and adds that Nestorius is thus 'tied down to no theological expressions, but to the simple faith,' the answer is that this letter was written about a year before, prior to this second letter to Nestorius,³ and therefore cannot be taken as qualifying the demand that he should sign the twelve anathematisms, or consider himself deposed.

We now come to the crucial question of Cyril's conduct in regard to the opening of the Council of Ephesus before the arrival of the Antiochene or Oriental members.

Let us recall the situation. The imperial summons of a General Council had cut clean across the policy shaped by Celestine and by Cyril. It suspended the action of their sentence, and upheld for the present the *status quo*. By obeying it, they were obliged to acknowledge Nestorius as not excommunicate, and not deposed. Hence it is not accurate to say (p. lxxxii) that Nestorius, when he arrived at Ephesus, 'had already been severed from the communion of the greater part of Christendom,' if this means that he was then excommunicate. Not only had he never previously been tried, but during the preliminary conferences it was the Bishop of Constantinople whom efforts were made to reclaim; and even during the first session of the Council he was spoken of as 'the most religious Nestorius.' Theodosius had ordered the Council to meet on Whitsunday, June 7, 431. But several bishops had not arrived, and the Emperor had also ordered that whatever was done should be done by 'common consent.'⁴

¹ They are approved by the next two Councils.

² Gennadius (Facundus, ii. 4).

³ See the two forms of it in Aubert, *Epist.* 8, and Mercator, ed. Baluze, p. 103, and compare Tillemont, xiv. 337.

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1120.

A fortnight passed. The Bishop of Antioch and his suffragans were still absent; the prelates at Ephesus were suffering seriously from the heat, and could not understand why the 'Orientals' did not arrive. It was apparently on Sunday the 21st that Cyril, who had just sent off a letter to John of Antioch to say that the Council was waiting for him,¹ received from John a kindly-worded note, to the effect that he was now only 'five or six halting-places' distant.² What was now to be done? The natural and regular course would have been to wait until the time specified, or at least, as Candidian (the Imperial Commissioner) requested, for four days; but Cyril and the majority, in spite of remonstrances and protests,³ decided to open the Council on the next day, and did so. Were they justified in this: or, since they clearly acted at his instigation,⁴ was he justified? Dr. Pusey argues for the affirmative, to the following effect: "It does not require much humility to think that S. Cyril" had sufficient reasons for what he did. He "must have known" that he was incurring peril by disobeying the Emperor, and braving his commissioner, Candidian. But the thing to be done was to secure the deposition of Nestorius; and this could not well be secured if John and his friends were to arrive, bent (as Cyril might have just learned) on procuring a condemnation of the twelve anathemas, sure of Candidian's support in making this the first business of the Council, and likely enough to find backers ready for any violence, such as afterwards in that very city turned a Synod into a "Latrocinium." And after all, it could make no practical difference. The Church had spoken her mind. The Nestorianizers "were but a fraction. No injustice," therefore, "was done to Nestorius" by not waiting for John when they were close at hand; and the popular feeling at Ephesus was largely in Cyril's favour.' (Pref. p. lxxxii.)

We confess that the *argumentum ad verecundiam* has little weight with us, in view of certain antecedents already mentioned. Then we cannot help observing that the plea falsifies the excuse made by Cyril, that John was purposely loitering⁵—an excuse which Dr. Pusey almost seems to countenance, but which Neale examines and puts wholly aside.⁶ Of two things one: if he was loitering, then the theory of

¹ Mansi, iv. 1272. ² *Ib.* iv. 1121. Cyril's *Apologeticus*, 252 A.

³ Mansi, v. 765, 770.

⁴ Neale, i. 258. It would be ridiculous to suppose that Cyril was overborne by the other bishops.

⁵ Mansi, iv. 1229; and Cyril's *Apologeticus*, in Pusey's edit. p. 441.

⁶ *Hist. Alex.* i. 258. See also Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, iii. 350.

his being determined to push for a condemnation of Cyril's articles breaks down. Cyril could not at once suspect the former and fear the latter. As to the numbers, sixty-eight bishops did indeed sign a remonstrance against proceeding to business without the 'Easterns,' although John's 'conciliabulum,' when it met a few days later, could only muster forty-three; but the sixty-eight, as events showed, were not a compact Nestorianizing body,¹ and Cyril could not but know that, in any event, he would have a clear majority in the full Council. He had 158 to begin with, and his clear-headedness and resolution were sure to draw over not a few waverers. Force would have been a dangerous card for his opponents. Candidian himself did not attempt to clear S. Mary's church when the bishops persisted in assembling. Cyril had his Egyptian seamen within reach, and could handle them as well as another; Memnon of Ephesus, as Dr. Pusey observes, had the support of the 'peasantry' of his Church estates, and of the city population. Again we say, of two things one: the suggestion that there was peril of a Nestorian triumph, and the suggestion that the Nestorianizers were a feeble folk not worth considering, cannot stand together. Moreover, was it 'no injustice to Nestorius' himself, on the part of a Patriarch who had already committed himself very decidedly against him, to insist on not waiting even a little longer for another Patriarch who was generally disposed in his favour, and who would also take the tone of a friend in urging the test-word on his acceptance? unless, indeed, the profession of holding a trial were but a pretence. Doubtless, some allowance must be made for Cyril's disappointment at having to take the case through a Council at all. But he could well have afforded to respect the forms of order and fairness; and his true interest would therein have coincided with his duty. Supposing he had answered Candidian and the other remonstrants, 'Our brother John shall have no reason to complain; we will wait yet those few days more, and when he and his friends arrive, God will defend His own truth;' would he not have taken up a noble position, and rendered to his cause a supreme service? He afterwards asked in a tone of triumphant confidence, why John, on arriving, had not come straight into Council and taxed him with heresy; intimating that the bishops would have been sure to condemn him if the charge had been made good.² Even if John had attacked the articles, might not

¹ See Preface, p. xxxi; Hefele, *Hist. Councils*, s. 134.

² *Apologeticus*, p. 447 (ed. Pusey).

Cyril have pointed out their true import in connexion with the letter to which they were appended, and which John had not seen when he called them Apollinarian? 'John himself,' says Dr. Pusey, 'held and stated the true faith, and thought the word Theotocos the convenient and true way to express it; and that to reject it would jeopardize the unspeakable mystery.'¹ If so, the most that could have been carried by Syrian influence was a proposal for some expansion of the articles, in order to exhibit that other side of the complex truth which Cyril really held, and which he was afterwards to emphasize by accepting the Formulary of Reunion; and this would have been so much gain to Catholic truth. What discord, what scandal, what distress to pious souls, might thus have been avoided! The heresiarch would have been unable to pose as a man unfairly treated. The great Nestorian communion might very likely never have existed; at any rate Cyril would have acted unimpeachably, and might have left results to God. Why did he act otherwise? Apparently because he wanted to get Nestorius condemned as quickly and as unanimously as possible, to identify the Council's action with his own of the preceding autumn, and also to avoid the annoyance of having to defend his anathemas in Council against John, or Andrew, or Theodoret. So on that Sunday he resisted, and doubtless encouraged or stimulated his adherents to resist, all remonstrances against precipitate action; so he professed to think that John did not mean to come in time, while he himself meant to make sure that he should not come in time: so on the Monday morning, quite early in the synodical proceedings, he quoted the Emperor's letter as if it ordered the bishops to proceed 'without any delay,' whereas the words were, 'without any disturbance';² and Theodosius, while directing that the doctrinal question should be taken first, had required also, as we have seen, that it should be decided by the joint action of all. So afterwards he took advantage of John's verbal message, 'If I tarry, set about your work,' as if it did not obviously mean, 'If I am delayed beyond the time which I have specified';³ and in his *Apologeticus* to Theodosius he referred to it as if it had not had a conditional clause, but had been to the effect 'that we

¹ Preface, p. lxvii; Mansi, iv. 1065. Cyril, indeed, wrote to the Emperor after the Council that John was, 'beyond question, of one mind with Nestorius.' *Apologet.* p. 441.

² Mansi, iv. 1119-1129; Tillemont, xiv. 395.

³ This is well put by Mr. Pusey, Pref. p. xxx. So Tillemont, xiv. 392.

were not to wait at all for his coming, but rather proceed.' Into such disingenuousness was he most unhappily led by the determination which Neale traces to 'a momentary weakness of faith,' and of which he says, 'that the fault brought its own punishment in the confusions that ensued is but too plain.'¹ Nor can Facundus be blamed for saying, 'Hinc exstitit totius causa discidii: hinc omnis tumultus sumpsit originem.'² Alas, that the 'Doctor of the Incarnation' should have been on this occasion one by whom offence came: that even now, after so many ages, his conduct can be cited as a warning instance of the readiness of strong-willed ecclesiastics, while aiming sincerely at the good of the Church, or of the Faith, to compass their ends—*quocunque modo*!

'S. Cyril showed his peace-loving disposition on his return to Egypt.' Hardly so in the 'Defence' addressed to the Emperor, written while his resentment against the 'Nestorianizers' was fresh, and containing some things painful to read, after all allowance for provocation. The Preface mentions the negotiations for peace between him and the 'Eastern' or Syrian bishops, but does not bring out the fact that the Emperor himself was urgent with both parties, so that Cyril as well as John was concerned to arrive at a concordat. The Formulary which Paul of Emesa presented to Cyril in the winter of 432 had been originally drafted by Theodoret in 431 for presentation to Theodosius; the beginning and the conclusion, which reflected on Cyril's articles, being struck out.³ One part of it would directly meet the demand of Alexander of Hierapolis, that Cyril should explicitly refer the sufferings of the incarnate Saviour to His manhood.⁴ Cyril accepted it, although he would have wished it to be still more explicit on the Personal Union,⁵ as to which, however, we may well think that it was plain enough for all practical purposes. On the other hand, it laid rather greater stress on the distinction between our Lord's natures than Cyril had been wont to do; but he acquiesced in this, says Tillemont, 'in order to destroy the suspicion, or even the belief, that he and other Catholics confounded them.'⁶ The twelve anathemas were

¹ *Hist. Alex.* i. 259.

² *Def. cap.* vii. 2.

³ See the *Synodicon*, c. 91, 96, 97, in Mansi, v. 871, 878.

⁴ *Synodicon*, c. 57. Cyril had already done so, again and again, as the present volume will show (see places cited in the index, p. 383); but this old bishop was doggedly prejudiced, although perhaps rather a Nestorianizer than a Nestorian.

⁵ *S. Cyr. Epist.* p. 134.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 118; Tillemont, xiv. 524. Yet Cyril had repeatedly denied any 'fusion;' and in *Adv. Theod.* 4, he had distinctly admitted the difference between 'words' which related to the Godhead of Christ and those

not withdrawn, for Cyril, as Dr. Pusey points out, had most reasonably rejected a former proposal for their withdrawal, even though backed by civil authority; but they were at any rate kept in the background, and some Easterns boasted that he had been induced to retract them,¹ which of course he denied in letters to his old friends. Of the difficulty which such friends found in reconciling his adoption of the Syrian Formulary with his former employment of the phrase, 'one φύσις of God the Word, and that incarnate,' which he believed to be Athanasian, we will only say that this phrase, whether Athanasian or not, was an undesirable one in the existing development of theological terminology, but that, as used by Cyril, it was wholly clear of Monophysitism in the technical sense of the word; for not only did he explain it, as in effect he had done before the Reunion,² to mean the one Son of God, and that Son as having assumed humanity,³ but some years afterwards he cordially approved of the Tome of Proclus, in which 'one hypostasis' was tacitly substituted for 'one φύσις,' so as to indicate 'one person.'

We wish that it were not necessary to say anything else as to Cyril's relations with the Imperial court during the negotiations for the reunion, and with the Easterns in the period immediately following it. But Dr. Pusey has omitted to notice two facts which, in our opinion, have some bearing on his thesis as to the saintly and the peacemaking character of the great Archbishop.

One is his free use of money in the form of gifts, called in the style of that age 'eulogiæ,' in order to secure Court

which were 'appropriate to the limitations of the emptying;' only he contended (as the Formulary indeed acknowledged) that both the θεοπεριῆ and the ἀνθρώπινα belonged to the one Christ.

¹ Comp. *Synodicon*, c. 101.

² See the present volume, p. 264; and compare the second letter to Succensus, written after the Reunion, where he says that the phrase is quite consistent with holding that our Lord has 'our essence,' and is 'perfect in Manhood as in Godhead' (*Epist.* p. 144). Mr. Pusey points out (p. 341) that the phrase is "one incarnate nature of the Word," not "one nature of the incarnate Word," which would be the Monophysite heresy. Yet the word 'nature' does not to our ears represent φύσις, here used by S. Cyril. See *Adv. Orient.* 8, where φύσις comes between προσώπου and ὑπόστασις (comp. *ib.* 3), and *Ep. 3 to Nest.* c. 5: 'Parity of honour does not unite τὰς φύσεις, as Peter and John are equal in honour, but the two are not one.' In *Adv. Theod.* 2, φύσις is first used for ὑπόστασις, and in the next clause is applied to human 'nature' in a sense excluding human personality. Compare *Adv. Nest.* ii. 13 (*E. T.* p. 77), where ἕνασιν φύσιν is explained by καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνώσει. Yet elsewhere Cyril explains φυσικὴν by 'true.' *Adv. Orient.* c. 3. The sense of such words was still somewhat fluctuating.

influence. A letter of his archdeacon, Epiphanius, to Maximian, the successor of Nestorius, preserved by Cyril's enemy, Irenæus, and translated into Latin, with the other documents of the same collection,¹ by an African of the next century (Preface, p. xxxii), shows that the Church funds of Alexandria had been drawn upon in 433 to supply presents of this sort for the Princess Pulcheria herself, and for seven personages at the Court, to the annoyance of Cyril's own clergy. Gibbon makes capital of this very unlucky document;² and although we must bear in mind the immemorial Eastern custom of propitiating great men with gifts, yet we cannot think that what orthodox writers would probably have called a bribe if sent by a Nestorian becomes a 'blessing' on the part of a Cyril. A real Saint does not conform to questionable fashions of his time: he rises above them, and by his conduct rebukes them. Flavian of Constantinople set a better example than Cyril when, at his consecration, he sent to the Emperor's chamberlain 'eulogiæ,' not of gold, but of white bread, and added that the goods of the Church could not be parted with save for the poor.³ It is another instance of that want of what may be called religious delicacy in the choice of means which we have already had to observe in Cyril. Such delicacy would perhaps have seemed to him unpractical fastidiousness; but he had better have remembered certain words of S. Peter. It is of this transaction that Tillemont says, in his sternly pure tone, 'S. Cyril is a saint, but one cannot say that all his actions are holy (*saintes*); and the greatest saints have much reason to dread the temptation which impels us to regard as lawful what seems to promise us success in holy enterprises. The children of light must employ no arms but those of light...; we must fight for God according to God's laws, if we wish Him to crown us, and must serve Him according to the rules which He lays down for us, not according to those which human wisdom, which is much opposed to Divine, may suggest.'⁴ Golden words of a high-minded French priest, which should be in the hearts of all who have to work for the Church in the face of the world.

The other matter to which we have referred belongs to the year 436. Theodosius had issued a decree, that all

¹ *Synodicon*, c. 202.

² Gibbon, vi. 22.

³ Fleury, b. 27, c. 12. Cyril himself could use *δαροδοκία* as an opprobrious term (*Apologet.* p. 451). Yet Nestorius says he shot at him with golden arrows (Serm. 12 in Garnier, 4 in Baluze).

⁴ Tillemont, xiv. 541.

'Eastern' prelates should anathematize Nestorius, and call his heresy 'Simonian.' But Cyril was not content with the bare wording of this mandate; he insisted, in a letter to the bishop of Tyre, that Nestorian errors should be condemned in detail; and he desired the Emperor's commissioner to 'prepare' the bishops to accept a new formulary, which he had drafted for the purpose.¹ It was more simply 'Cyrilline' than the confession which he had accepted in 432; and, as Tillemont drily remarks, 'Il ne dit pas un mot de la déclaration faite pour la paix,' the substance of which ought at least to have been embodied in any new test which it might be thought necessary to prepare. He concludes this letter to Aristolaus by respectfully assuming that the exaction of the new declaration was within the intentions of the Emperor.

The account of the discussion as 'to the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia' (Preface, p. xcvi) does not give a clear impression as to the order of events, or an adequate one as to Cyril's own view. The paragraph reads as if written to show that he 'was everywhere the peacemaker, whose natural element was not controversy,' who wished only to 'go on his way in peace.' To the question—Was Irenæus correct in tracing to Cyril the whole movement against Theodore's writings, as if the monk Maximus were but his instrument?²—it is answered, that Irenæus is 'refuted' by the fact that 'the Antiochenes' ('Alexandrians' is a misprint) 'appealed to S. Cyril' in support of their refusal 'to sign the Tome of S. Proclus' after the name of Theodore had been prefixed by Maximus, clean against Proclus' intentions, to the extracts which Proclus requested them to condemn. But, supposing Cyril to have really instigated Maximus, were the Easterns sure to know of it? and, even if they did know of it, might they not, with the usual diplomacy of the period, have thought well to assume that he would enter into their feelings? On the question of fact, we are by no means positive that Irenæus was right; his animosity against 'the Egyptians,' as shown in his context, goes far to invalidate his testimony; but Tillemont thought that 'S. Cyril might really have been the author' of the movement,³ although not for the reasons which Irenæus was pleased to imagine. On the other hand, Cyril's letter to Proclus seems to point the other way. However, Cyril said more against Theodore than Dr. Pusey takes account of; for, as he himself tells Acacius, he wrote to John that 'Theodore had both a blasphemous tongue' (this seems to be the sense of

¹ *Synodicon*, c. 194. Tillemont, xiv. 619.

² *Synodicon*, c. 196.

³ Tillemont, xiv. 624.

δύσφημον, and so Aubert renders it¹) 'and a pen that did it good service.' At the request of Maximus himself, Cyril wrote, in the form of a letter, his commentary on the Nicene Creed, in which he ranked Theodore with Nestorius.² He sent copies of it, on vellum, to the Emperor and the princesses; and he wrote to clerics of his at Constantinople in the same sense,³ concluding, 'It is our duty . . . to endeavour, to the utmost of our power, to crush the impiety that has risen up against Christ;' clearly alluding to those who, as he expressed it, 'while pretending to abhor Nestorius,' were circulating 'Theodore's books on the Incarnation.' The readers of this Preface would hardly gather that, in Tillemont's words, it was only after 'the remonstrances of S. Cyril and of Proclus had failed to move the Easterns to take any step against Theodore, that the Saint thought it his duty to yield to this resistance.'⁴ Tillemont, indeed, credits him with much patience before beginning to 'work for the condemnation' of Theodore's writings, as well as with prudence in 'ceasing to pursue it when he saw the trouble which it caused.'⁵ But, in view of the facts, how can we say that 'everywhere he is the peacemaker?' And we must, with all respect, express our surprise at the sentence:

'S. Cyril thought it indeed right to correct in writing the errors of Theodore, *but this disturbed no peace, since Theodore was gone.*'

Yet, in the page preceding, John of Antioch had been quoted as telling Cyril that the Easterns 'would rather be burnt' than condemn Theodore; he also declared that the mere stirring of the question had raised 'a new storm';⁶ and it was doubtless he who informed Cyril that the people cried out in the very churches, 'May Theodore's faith spread! we believe as did Theodore!'⁷ It was precisely because peace had been so much 'disturbed' by an attack on the memory of the dead 'Expositor' that Cyril at last wrote to Proclus to this effect:⁸ 'Nestorianism having been anathematized, Theodore's errors are virtually "cast out" with it, and if there had been no agitation to be expected among the Easterns, I should have said that there would be no difficulty

¹ *Cyr. Epist.* p. 197.

² *Ibid.* p. 190. 'He traced the evil which he denounced . . . beyond the person and the age of Nestorius . . . He fixed the blame upon Theodore . . . and he was right.'—Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, iii. 345.

³ *Ibid.* p. 198.

⁴ Tillemont, xiv. 641.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 625.

⁶ *Cyril. Epist.* p. 199.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 197.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 200.

in requiring them to do this also in express terms; but from what I have learned I think that those who have taken up the matter had better be persuaded to let it drop.' He writes like a man who wishes that a certain course had been feasible, but gives up when he finds that it will not do; and the Preface does not bring this out. To be sure, in writing on his own account against Theodore's opinions, he did not anathematize him by name; but amid such a state of feeling in 'the East' as he has himself described to us, one can hardly think that he would 'disturb no peace' by apostrophizing Theodore as 'a blasphemer who spoke iniquity against God'¹—that is, if his own work was to have any circulation in the region where Theodore's influence had been so noxious. We have no doubt that it was necessary to 'correct' these 'errors;' but, in fact, this could not be done without sacrificing peace, for the time, to the defence of truth.

At this point the Preface refers to Theodoret's criticism on the ninth of Cyril's articles. But it does not state the case quite fully. Theodoret had before him Cyril's statement that the Holy Spirit was the Son's own Spirit, and had not acted on Him as an exterior or foreign power enabling Him to work miracles. Theodoret says of this that if 'His own Spirit' means that the Holy Spirit is of the same nature as the Son and proceeds from the Father, he accepts this as orthodox; but if it means that He received His existence from or through the Son, he rejects this as blasphemous and impious; and he quotes S. John xv. 26, 1 Cor. ii. 12. How does Cyril meet this in his rejoinder? He does *not* say, 'The Holy Spirit is from or through the Son.' He repeats that Christ was not wrought upon by the Spirit, as from without; that the Spirit was His Spirit even as He was the Father's; he quotes Rom. viii. 8, 9, and goes on: 'For the Holy Spirit proceedeth from God the Father, according to the Saviour's words, but is not foreign (*ἀλλότριον*) to the Son, for He (the Son) hath all things with the Father,' quoting S. John xvi. 15; 'therefore the Holy Spirit, by working miracles, glorified Jesus, but as *His* Spirit,' &c. This, of course, Theodoret could accept. Again, in the great letter to John of Antioch, which Mr. Pusey calls œcumenical, because it was solemnly approved by the Council of Chalcedon: 'The Spirit of God the Father, who proceedeth from the Father, but is not foreign to the Son in regard to His essence' (*i.e.* in virtue of the Consubstantiality). This state-

¹ See the present volume, pp. 342, 346.

ment was also approved by Theodoret.¹ Now if Cyril had held the 'double eternal procession' as *de fide*, he could not be excused for suppressing all mention of it in these two crucial passages. Elsewhere, indeed, he has freely used $\epsilon\kappa$ or $\epsilon\zeta$ of the Holy Spirit's relation to the Son.² Yet, speaking with diffidence, we cannot but think that some of his strong sayings relate to that 'coming forth' in time which may be called a 'mission,'³ or to a derivation from that essence which is the Son's 'as well as the Father's.'⁴ Certainly in parts of the fourth book against Nestorius, what is kept full in view is the 'going forth of the Spirit,' as the Son's Spirit, through the Son, or the Son's action in 'putting Him forth' or 'bestowing Him' on mankind. How far, however, this derivation, to S. Cyril's mind, involved an essential and eternal procession from or through the Son is the question.⁵ As we have seen, he forbore to assert such a derivation when it was gainsaid by an opponent; it was an idea, not a fixed point of faith. And in one remarkable passage of a treatise written in 430, we find 'He is from the Father naturally, being poured forth through the Son upon the creation;'⁶ and in the third letter to Nestorius, written some months later, 'The Spirit is not foreign to the Son, for He is called the Spirit of Truth, and "the Truth" is Christ; and He is poured out from ($\pi\alpha\rho$) Him, as also from ($\epsilon\kappa$) God the Father.' Mr. Pusey, in the index to his edition, had referred to this last passage somewhat boldly: 'Ex Patre Filioque procedit.' He should have written, 'A Filio, sicut ex Patre, effunditur.' That S. Cyril would have applied $\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ to any relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son, we suppose no one will maintain.⁷

¹ See his letter to John, approving as orthodox the 'Egyptian letter,' wherein 'the Holy Spirit is set forth not as having His existence from or through the Son,' &c. This he assumes to be Cyril's meaning.—Mansi, v. 384.

² E.g. *Ad Theodosium*, p. 120 (Pusey); *Explan.* c. 9 (written at Ephesus); *Thesaurus*, p. 354, &c.

³ E.g. *Thesaurus*, p. 345. 'Out of' might sometimes, at least, be used in this sense, with reference to S. John i. 16.

⁴ *De S. Trinitate*, p. 642. *In S. Joann.* l. 10, p. 926.

⁵ Dr. Pusey maintains the affirmative (*On 'And the Son,'* p. 134). Mr. Swete quotes a passage from the *Thesaurus* (p. 358, Aubert), which, he says, 'bases' the mission on the derivation (*Hist. Doctr. Procession*, p. 150). It is at any rate clear that S. Cyril's mind had been working in the direction of the Western doctrine, as it is called, and this by way of development of $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$.

⁶ *Ad Arcad. Marinamque*, p. 157 (Pusey). It is in this sense, we suppose, that not a few Anglicans take the *Filioque* clause now.

⁷ See *Adv. Nest.* iv. 2 (E. T. p. 133), a decisive passage.

Let us now turn to the personal history of Nestorius. We heartily adopt all that Dr. Pusey has ever written on the vast importance, for Christian belief and life, of the doctrine which Nestorianism denies. That must needs be a deadly heresy which substitutes an 'association' for a 'personal union,' and thereby reduces the difference between our Lord and the Saints to a difference merely of degree,¹ so that the Incarnation is really annulled. We fear that a good deal of religiously intended writing on Christ's earthly life and work is unconsciously semi-Nestorian; and we never come across it without mentally having recourse to those wonderful sermons on the Incarnation in the sixth volume of Newman's *Parochial Sermons*. For instance:—

'Though man, He was not, strictly speaking in the English sense of the word, *a man*.² He was not such as one of us, and one out of a number. He was man because He had our human nature wholly and perfectly; but His Person is not human like ours, but Divine. . . . As He had no earthly father, so has He no human personality. . . . Thus, when He prayed to His Father, it was not the prayer of a man supplicating God, but of the Eternal Son, who had ever shared the glory of the Father, addressing Him as before, but under far other circumstances, and in a new way . . . in the economy of redemption, and . . . through the feelings and thoughts of human nature. . . . When He poured out His precious blood upon the Cross, it was not a man's blood, though it belonged to His manhood, but blood full of power and virtue . . . as issuing most mysteriously from Him who is the Creator of the world. . . . The manhood which He assumed . . . He received into His divine essence (if we may dare so to speak) almost as a new attribute of His Person; of course, I speak by way of analogy, but I mean as simply and indissolubly. . . . All that is necessary to constitute a perfect manhood is attached to His Eternal Person, absolutely and entirely, belonging to Him as really and fully as His justice, truth, or power.'

'Man's nature was as much and as truly Christ's as His Divine attributes. . . . When He suffered, it was God suffering. Not that the Divine Nature itself could suffer, any more than our soul can see or hear; but, as the soul sees and hears through the organs of the body, so God the Son suffered in that human nature which He had taken to Himself and made His own. . . . Think of this, all ye light-hearted, and consider whether, with this thought, you can read the last chapters of the four Gospels without fear and trembling. For instance . . . "one of the officers . . . struck Jesus. . . ." The words must be said, though I hardly dare say them,—*that officer lifted up his hand against God the Son*. This is not a figurative way of speaking, or a rhetorical form of words, or a harsh, extreme, and unadvisable

¹ *Preface*, p. xlv. *Adv. Nest.* i. 8. *Adv. Theodoret.* 10, &c.

² See the present volume, pp. xlv, 16, 255 ff, and Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 262.

statement. It is a literal and simple truth, it is a great Catholic doctrine. . . . I bid you consider that that face, so ruthlessly smitten, was the face of God Himself. . . . It was the blood, and the sacred flesh, and the hands, and the temples, and the side, and the feet of God Himself, which the frenzied multitude then gazed upon.'

We quote this, not only for its intrinsic doctrinal value, but lest we should be supposed either to underrate the theological services of S. Cyril, or to think inadequately of the issue which was raised by the teaching of Nestorius. But we must submit that a heresiarch, as a man, has his rights at the bar of history. He was often a keen thinker, enamoured of logical thoroughness.¹ It is but reasonable, in most cases, to credit him with some religious motives,² with a zeal not according to knowledge, with an eagerness in behalf of some one element of the truth, which, unhappily, he severed from the rest, and so misread and marred. It strikes us that, as this Preface paints the man Cyril in too brilliant colours, it paints his adversary too uniformly black, rather too much after the fashion of Garnier in his edition of Marius Mercator. Thus, we are told that Nestorius 'had shown himself practised in inflicting violence,' while Cyril's performances in that line are passed over. Nestorius had, indeed, given some scandal by his boastful speech to Theodosius;³ had won the nickname of 'Incendiary' by pulling down an Arian chapel, and so driving the Arians in despair to burn it;⁴ had procured a new law against all heretics (including, as he is careful to say, Psilanthropists);⁵ had harassed Novatians and Quartodecimans; had caused a destructive tumult in Asia Minor. But had not even Chrysostom 'deprived many Novatians and Quartodecimans of their churches'⁶? And had not Cyril begun his episcopate by 'shutting up the churches of Novatians, seizing on their sacred furniture, and depriving their bishop of his personal property'?⁷ Nestorius dealt severely enough with some monks and laymen who had denounced him to his face, or proclaimed that he was no true bishop; and his writings, jotted with apostrophes to a supposed 'heretic,' show that in controversy he was no gentler than his opponents. Those sermons and fragments of sermons, and a few extant letters, might convey the impression that he was a deliberate theological revolutionist, using sophistry

¹ See Mozley, on *Theory of Development*, p. 42 ff.

² Neale allows such to Nestorius, *Hist. Alex.* i. 234.

³ Soc. vii. 29.

⁴ Not, however, to 'throw themselves into the flames.' Pref. p. xlv. See Soc. i. c.

⁵ *Synodic.* c. 6.

⁶ Soc. vi. 11.

⁷ Soc. vii. 7.

as a means to his end. One is provoked by his irrelevances and ambiguities; by his apparent insensibility to explanations; by his attacks on positions which no one defended; by his habit of affirming 'one Son' when he meant an association of two,—'distinguishing the Divine and human natures' in the sense of assigning them to different beings,—using 'temple' now for the body of Jesus, and now for Jesus Himself, regarded as a human individual,—above all, pretending to secure the worship of such a Jesus by giving Him rank, *honoris causa*, with the Word. He could also deal in pitiful quibbles as to 'two *γεννήσεις* meaning, after all, two Sons,' as to the purport of the Nicene Creed, and as to the texts, 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday,' &c., 'they would not have crucified the Lord of glory,' &c. Yet it may be that this was, on the whole, due rather to confusedness than to craftiness. He was, we know, a verbose and confident speaker. He had obviously taken Theodore's Christology for his own without troubling himself to check it by the study of earlier writers.¹ He must be credited with a genuine dread of a heathenish or an Apollinarian debasement of the Divine spirituality, and with a misguided 'reverence,' as S. Cyril himself calls it,² which recoiled from the immensity of a condescension to 'the Virgin's womb;' and thus he may have been striving to disguise from himself, as well as from others, the extent to which he had drifted from the belief in a Divine Incarnation.³ He would not see that his theory was at bottom only a decorated Humanitarianism, since it could not say 'Christ is God' without the saving clause, 'that is, titularly,' and thereby said in effect, 'Not a God Incarnate, but a God-bearing man.' Dr. Pusey cites 'a grave historian' as to his terror of the word Theotocos; yet Socrates, in the same context, says he cannot treat Nestorius as a Psilanthropist.⁴ And although 'Theotocos' had been, as Dr. Pusey says, 'in familiar use by every school for nearly two centuries,' it is fair to remember

¹ Soc. vii. 32. Yet he may have been misled by the earlier use of *ἀνθρώπος* for manhood, even in S. Athanasius. See Card. Newman, *Treat. of S. Athan.* ii. 366, ed. 2.

² *Adv. Nest.* iv. 5. Compare Preface, p. xxxix.

³ He repeatedly used orthodox language; see, e.g., the passage quoted in *Adv. Nest.* i. 3 (E. T. p. 17). So in part of his second letter to S. Cyril.

⁴ Soc. l. c. Eusebius of Dorylæum, even then a fiery zealot, although as yet only a layman, made out a parallel between him and Paul of Samosata, which was faulty in that Paul denied the personality of the Divine Word. But when Nestorius accentuates his own difference from Paul (Serm. 12 in Garnier, 4 in Baluze), he speaks as if he believed in the eternal Divinity of Christ, which, properly speaking, he did not.

that Nestorius urged that among the schools which accepted it were the Arian and Apollinarian.¹ The phrase was not an exclusively orthodox one. It had been adopted and perverted by heretics; and so Nestorius himself, when he offered to tolerate it if used with 'Anthropotocos' or 'Christotocos,' misused it² in the interest of that mere 'connexion' between God the Word and a human Jesus, which involved what S. Cyril calls a 'non-essential'³ indwelling, identical in kind with the relation between God and 'that of any devout Christian.'⁴ To this, after all, it came: the pith of the matter lay in his utterance at Ephesus before the Council opened, and when two bishops who had been his friends made an attempt to win him over: 'I dare not call a babe of two months old God.'⁵ For then neither could a man of thirty-three be called God; and one of his adherents was consistent in saying that the Jews at the Crucifixion had sinned, not against God, but against a man—words ominously like those used by Theodotus of Byzantium at the close of the second century: 'I did not deny God, but a man.'⁶ Dr. Pusey may well say, 'There was nothing further to investigate.'

Condemned by the Church and abandoned by the State, Nestorius was allowed to live in his own monastery near Antioch for nearly two years after his old friend the 'Eastern' patriarch had resumed communion with the see of Alexandria. But in 435, at John's own request, he was banished, first to Petra, then to the Oasis. Dr. Pusey says:—

'With his sufferings there, in consequence of edicts of the Emperor, the Church had nothing to do. His treatment by the Emperor is unexplained. But the sufferings were God's temporal judgment inflicted through the State. The Church was guiltless of them. Yet, since whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, they showed that God had not abandoned him to the last.'

This passage, as might have been expected from the author, is very different in tone from the language of Evagrius on the same subject.⁷ Yet we cannot admit that if those sufferings were decreed by Theodosius, the Church had no responsibility in the matter. This was the prince who scrupled to eat because an insolent 'ascetic,' on being denied a request, had pretended to excommunicate him.⁸ Now,

¹ Nest. Sermon. l. c.

² *Id.* As Theodore had done. See this volume, p. 356.

³ Συγγνωστόν. See the present volume, pp. 14, 35, 215.

⁴ Preface, p. lxxvi.

⁵ Mansi, iv. 118.

⁶ Epiphanius, *Har.* 54. 1.

⁷ Evagr. i. 7.

⁸ Theodoret, v. 37.

when a priesthood has a monarch completely under its tutelage, it cannot say of his severity towards persons under its censure, 'That is no concern of ours;' for such severity must in all reason be set down, directly or indirectly, to its prompting. However, it is possible that the governor of the Thebaid, to whose written or unwritten orders Nestorius attributed much that befell him, had acted without special instructions from Constantinople; and in that case we hope that he was not seeking to gratify the Primate of Egypt. As to the phrase, 'God's temporal judgment,' we deprecate its use in this connexion. The sufferings of Nestorius resemble too closely those sufferings which wore out the life of that other exile, on whose throne, although unworthily, he had sat; and Cyril, in his youth, must often have heard, and probably learned to repeat, that his uncle's sentence had been confirmed by 'Divine judgments' at Cucusus, at Arabissus, at Comana. It is surely the safest course for such as we are to restrict the penal interpretation of human misery to cases in which signal wickedness is 'found out,' even in this life, by a conspicuous retribution.

It has been painful to us, as our readers will believe, to express any difference of opinion from the most venerable person in the English Church, whose claims on the love, reverence, and gratitude of her members have been for many years unique. It has seemed, however, a simple duty to say what we think, even although on certain points we have been unable to follow him. Our consolation is this, that the case is really exceptional,—that Dr. Pusey's panegyric on S. Cyril is in great measure the result of feelings strictly personal and incommunicable; and that we have said less on the other side than has been said by Cardinal Newman. To his view, on the whole, we must adhere, because we think it substantially the historical one; although we may not feel called upon to follow it in every detail, nor again to assume that *because* S. Cyril has been authoritatively canonized, he must have 'cancelled at length whatever was wrong in his words or his deeds by good works in compensation.' But, with the great Cardinal, we most heartily say, 'Cyril's faults were not inconsistent' with the 'virtues' of 'faith, firmness, intrepidity, fortitude, endurance, perseverance,' and, we must add, with an intense religious devotion to the honour of his Divine Redeemer and Lord.

The treatises which, in this volume, appear in an English dress, are somewhat varied in their character.

The Scholia, or Notes, are not directly polemical in tone,

although they traverse most of the ground which was traversed by the contending parties, as, the force of *κένωσις* in Phil. ii. 7, the nature of the 'union,' as real and personal yet without 'confusion,' its uniqueness, as contrasted with the Divine indwelling in a saint, the sufferings of Christ as appropriated by His Divine Person, though external to His Godhead, so that He might be said to have 'suffered and yet not suffered,' &c. Mr. Pusey refers to the mystical interpretations which occur in this treatise. The other writings of S. Cyril, entire or fragmentary, contained in this volume, are distinctly controversial; and they do not seem, we must confess, to support the tender paradox, that 'controversy was not his natural element.' If he had not taken up any controversy before 429, the fact is, as the Preface admits (p. xcix), that within his own area there had been none to take up. These treatises show him to have been, as Leontius¹ says, a 'most ardent assailant' of heresy; keen, vigilant, ready-witted, apt at logical force, with rhetoric equally at command, unsparing in denunciation, somewhat disposed to sarcastic irony, and evidently enjoying any opportunity of exposing an *ignoratio elenchi* or a valueless admission. We see this especially in the first books 'Against Nestorius,' the peculiar value of which, among the other anti-Nestorian works of the author, consists in the fact that he cites and comments upon forty-nine extracts from a book of sermons by Nestorius, which he describes as 'orderly and systematically arranged.' One of the most remarkable contexts is the reply to Nestorius' argument (if such it could be called) from S. John vi. 57 (*Adv. Nest.* iv. 5).

"The Word," says S. Cyril, "being by nature Life, made lifegiving that Flesh which was united to Him. . . . We eat, not consuming the Godhead (away with the folly!), but the very flesh of the Word which became lifegiving . . . since He made it His own by a true though inconceivable and ineffable union; so we, who partake of His holy Flesh and Blood, are in all respects and altogether quickened, since the Word abides in us Divinely through the Holy Spirit, and humanly also through the holy Flesh and the precious Blood."

This *rationale* of the Holy Communion, as implying the Divinity of Christ, without which to 'partake of His flesh' would 'profit nothing,' recurs repeatedly in his writings, and especially in the famous third letter to Nestorius, and in the Explanation of the eleventh article.

The dialogue entitled 'That Christ is One,' and com-

¹ Galland, *Biblioth. Patr.* xii. 690.

monly cited as the *Quod Unus*, states the issue with greater liveliness, and perhaps it may not be out of place to summarize part of its argument. Thus, after remarking on the inadequate sense given by Nestorians to the name Emmanuel, he goes on, in effect :—By Theotocos we mean simply, that by means of Mary 'the Word became flesh.' He did not thereby cease to be the Word. He continued to be God when He assumed our humanity, being born like unto us, sin excepted. This personal Incarnation is 'the root of our salvation.' Apart from His Divinity, His flesh could not quicken, nor His blood cleanse, nor His death deliver us from sin; nor could we be sons by grace, unless the Christ were Son by nature. It is thus no matter of common speculation; it is (and here we touch one of the secret springs of Cyril's energy) a question affecting immense religious interests. Is our Second Adam really a Divine Person, whose acts possess a Divine efficacy? Those who say No assail 'the august mystery of the Economy,' and 'dig up, withal, the foundation of our hope.' Again, on the Nestorian theory of a man associated with the Son of God, and allowed to share in His title, we should have to accept not an incarnate God, but a man supremely privileged, as our Saviour. How could such a man be a legitimate object of worship, although it were called 'relative'? The word 'connexion,' substituted by Nestorians for 'union,' is applicable to any sort of moral fellowship; and to this they reduce the 'mystery of godliness'! The Divine Son, in truth, 'assumed,' not an individual man, but 'the form of a servant.' If they say that the alleged 'connexion' justifies them in regarding 'the man' as a partner in Divine glory, they forget who has said, 'My glory will I not give to another.' Their theory impairs their idea of God. 'But,' they object, 'on your view, Christ being the Word, His body must be coessential with the Word.' Not at all: Godhead and manhood are distinct, though they exist in one Person. 'But is not this a fusion of two φύσεις into one?' I reply, there is one Son, and He has one φύσις, although He has assumed our manhood, which coexists with His Godhead.²

¹ So in *Adv. Theodoret.* c. 12, he urges that it is necessary to attribute to Him the sufferings of His flesh, in order to appreciate their redemptive virtue.

² In reply to the query, 'Are there then two φύσεις of God and man?' Cyril does not expressly say, 'Yes, there are,' as would have been said later. Here he prefers to use φύσις practically in the sense of person, as he says that 'every man is one, and his φύσις is one, although he is composed of soul and body' (Pusey's edition, p. 364).

The union of the two may be illustrated by that of soul and body in one man;¹ or, if you say, 'The Godhead would necessarily absorb the Manhood,' I deny it. Your theory really means two Sons, the inferior of whom is in a position *ejusdem generis* with that of all God's servants (a position in the abstract capable of forfeiture). After insisting on Rom. ix. 5, Phil. ii. 5 ff., 1 Cor. viii. 6, he denounces the 'connexion' theory as the unscriptural invention of a mind deficient in spiritual insight; it supposes a created 'partner with God,' an 'unreal' Son, a Saviour receiving salvation;² one who was, after all, only the grandest figure in the class of apostles and prophets. It is but right to add that in one context Cyril mars his own case, and does a violence to the most awful part of the Gospel story, by explaining away the cry 'My God, my God,' &c., as a mere intercession for mercy to fallen man. This is an instance of evasive interpretation, suggested by a misdirected reverence not unlike that against which he so eloquently warns Nestorianizers. And it is not in the least necessary to—rather, it is inconsistent with—the Cyrilline Christology; for if the Son of God could 'appropriate,' without prejudice to the Divinity, the pain or grief which affected His Manhood, why not also that mysterious spiritual anguish which formed the very climax of the Passion?

The Fragments at the end of the volume are nearly, but not altogether,³ identical with those previously published by Mr. Pusey, in the original Greek, or in Latin or Syriac versions in the third volume of his edition of the Commentary on S. John. For the most part, they are criticisms of anticipated Nestorianism in the writings of Diodore or Theodore, with extracts from both those celebrated writers, who too evidently cherished the same idea of an association between the Word and a chosen Man, called Son of God, in an improper sense.

Yet, later in this book, he speaks freely of ἡ ἀνθρώπου φύσις in Christ (*ibid.* p. 394), although generally he connects this word with our Lord's Eternal Being.

¹ See the present volume, pp. 192, 214, 339. Compare the 'Quicunque,' ver. 37, and Theodoret. *Epist.* 21, &c.

² One of the finest passages in the book; see it in Pusey's edition of the *De Recta Fide*, &c., p. 377. The Nestorian Christ was, in truth, like the Arian Son, 'a being who was not to be supposed' (Mozley).

³ *E.g.* the fifth extract from Book iii., against Theodore (p. 352), does not appear in the edition referred to, between the fourth and the long quotation from Theodore on Ps. viii.; on the other hand, of the translated extract at p. 364, from the fifth collation of the fifth General Council, Mr. Pusey says simply, that he 'had overlooked it, but it is pointed out by the indefatigable Tillemont' (in xiv. 643).

The last set of fragments is of singular interest, because the line therein taken against Apollinarianism shows that their author, S. Cyril, would not have sanctioned Monophysitism, either in its extreme or in its more moderate form.¹

The style of S. Cyril is not admired by Photius: he calls it artificial.² Tillemont, quoting this, adds somewhat severely, 'ses ouvrages sont . . . toujours embarrassés et obscurs, mais non pas toujours également,'³ and indulges himself, so to speak, at the end of his 159th 'article,' with telling us how King John III. of Sweden (whom the readers of Ranke's *Popes* will remember) had been 'disgusted with Calvin's books and sentiments, after reading some works of S. Cyril, although they are not the most agreeable among the writings of the Fathers.' His very intensity makes him often cumbrous and turbid; he feels too strongly to aim at literary grace; and, like S. Athanasius, he does not care how often he repeats himself, if determined iteration will impress a cardinal idea.⁴ Hence his readers learn to be familiar with, and to expect the recurrence of such phrases as 'remaining what He was,' 'impossible in His proper nature,' 'not by way of accidental connexion,' 'not a man as individually separate,' 'He appropriated what belonged to the flesh,' 'the limitations of the emptying,' or 'of the manhood.' It may be admitted that to present his writings to ordinary English readers, for whom the 'Library of the Fathers' is intended, cannot be a very easy task. One who undertakes it must indeed endeavour to be exact, not loosely paraphrastic; he cannot treat his author as freely as Symmachus treated the text of the Old Testament; but that is no reason for his imitating Aquila. Now, what is to be said of Mr. Pusey's version of these treatises?

We are reluctant to answer the question. Mr. Pusey was a most laborious collator and experienced judge of MSS., and

¹ Here his arguments from the Mediation and the Holy Eucharist for our Lord's true manhood, are remarkably like those of S. Leo against Eutyches, and are complementary to his argument noticed above, from the Eucharist to the personal Divinity.

² *Biblioth.* 49.

³ Tillemont, xiv. 664. There is a noble passage in *Adv. Nest.* v. 5 (E. T. p. 175), which might be borrowed by a Good Friday preacher, and another in *ib.* iii. 2. (p. 95), on the moral transformation of Christians through a Divine Christ; another, *ib.* iii. 6, on that Christ as second Adam; and others in the *Quod Unus* on the contrasts of the Incarnation, on its importance to our spiritual life, and on the Nestorian impoverishment of the great assurance, 'So God loved the world.'

⁴ 'Excuse me,' he says, 'I have no taste for tautology; but wherever that man's arguments tend, there, I am convinced, it is my duty to meet him.'—*Adv. Nest.* i. Intr.

a learned theological annotator. But translation was not his *forte*. He must, as a student, have been theoretically aware of the maxim, that translating implies a *transfer* of the author's meaning from the forms of the one language into the forms of the other, wherever they differ, as they often inevitably will; ¹ that, in one word, it must be idiomatic, or else it is not translating, but mere bald dogged construing, such as boys grow out of as they rise in their school. And, with Aubert's text and version before him, he must have observed that the good Canon of Laon seriously set himself to represent S. Cyril's Greek in correct if not elegant Latin. Mr. Pusey, however, made no such attempt in regard to English. He does not seem to have asked himself, 'Would this or that rendering put an Englishman in possession of what S. Cyril meant?' but rather, 'How can I show my loyalty to S. Cyril by sticking most closely, not only to the words, but even to their order and construction?' Loyalty of this sort is apt to wrong its object; and we must regret that the translation before us should be of a kind likely rather to repel than to attract the reader, and to invest the name of this great Catholic doctor with uncouth or bizarre associations. We are obliged to give a few samples of such literalism as is, to say the least, unfrequent in the volumes of the 'Library of the Fathers.'

'No mean kind of open-mouthedness,' 'in vile sort floating in feeblest ideas,' 'he crowns them with his vote unto their truth,' 'the uttermost of all unwitting,' 'through the utter obedience,' 'rushing full speed to forgetfulness that,' &c., 'replete with full much difficulty,' 'far removed from being to be believed by any,' &c.

Many times are sentences obscured for want of some little words, where the English idiom requires them, to help out the sense, as in quotations from Phil. ii. 8, and Heb. ii. 10, where 'being' and 'in' are left out, though found in A. V. So at p. 262, 'while' is wanted before 'confessing one Son;' at p. 197, 'it which was holden of unlearning' should be 'seeing it was held fast by ignorance.' In another passage, 'the soul . . . co-grieves, its own body suffering,' should be 'sympathizes indeed, because its own body is suffering.' At p. 261, after quoting Amos vii. 14, S. Cyril is made to go on, 'A goatherd, He set him.' Again, we have absolutely false English, such as 'nor knows it to suffer,' 'think not, stamping with false mark,' 'has his mission an impossibility' (for 'could not have been sent'), 'caught in Jewish accusals'

¹ See S. Jerome, *Epist.* 57, 11. Compare Sir E. Beckett on *The Revised New Testament*, pp. 24, 31-33.

(for 'involved in the same charge with the Jews'). Some sentences read almost like puzzles: 'hath witnessed to Himself freedom by nature,' for 'hath borne witness to His own natural freedom'; 'the count of their difference will speed apart,' for 'the law of their difference will have its own way'; 'arraying in slave-befitting measures the Spirit,' for 'subjecting the Spirit to servile limitations'; 'if thyself bear away the Word out of God from earthly body,' for 'if you yourself remove from an earthly body the Word who is from God'; 'feeling and kin and sure,' for 'sympathetic, akin to us, and unfailing'; 'our opponent is on all sides sick of uncomeliness of speech,' for 'our opponent's argument is thoroughly unsound and absurd.' Some phrases are even grotesque, as 'thine empty whistlings,' 'whetting against the Holy Spirit their . . . mouth;' the Jews' 'awkwardness' against Christ; 'some . . . wrinkle the holy Virgin,' where the strong verb used means to impair her dignity. 'Bairn' is a quaint rendering for *τεχθῆν* at p. 24, and 'humbug' an undignified one for *λῆρος* at p. 241. And our language is not so poor as to need the additions of 'unbeauty,' 'untaint' (for 'untainted'), 'inplaces,' 'ownness,' 'ensouls,' and worst of all, to 'engod' for to 'deify,' which occurs four times within four pages (pp. 71-74.)

But beside this faulty English, the construing is by no means uniformly accurate. We give some instances, as follows—

'You say that the Godhead of the Only-begotten was clearly and openly incarnate' (p. 15).

'Since to his most novel dogmas he opposes the truth and the very symbol of the Church's faith' (p. 29. This is nonsense).

'Since as little and human, and below the dignity of the Only-begotten, He receives the unction' (p. 108).

'The claim of the same names will . . . be contending with Him, and be striving for equality' (p. 66).

'We will show him a wiser and truer Emmanuel' (p. 174).

'But rather we must conceive that they hasten the straight way of the truth' (p. 201).

'This, that He was made flesh,

Rather, 'You plainly and openly say that the Godhead . . . was incarnate.'

'Since the very symbol of the Church's faith places the truth in opposition to his novel dogmas.'

'Since he (Nestorius) takes the anointing to be a small thing,' &c.

'That which has been graced with the same titles may naturally contend with Him, and strive for equality.'

'We will both more wisely and more truly show him the Emmanuel.'

'But rather to consider them and earnestly to work our way straight to the truth.'

'The fact that He became flesh

introduces with it, and has in its horizon what follows thereupon' is implied, and takes precedence, in our thought, of its results.' (p. 244).

At p. 168, 'The form of God, I am clad in servant's form,' should be, 'I, being (*ὑπάρχων*) the form of God, have clothed Myself in the form of a servant.' *Εὐδοξία* should not be rendered 'good glory' (p. 61), but simply 'glory,' its first sense being 'good reputation.' At p. 59, the correction of *κρατεῖν* for the ungrammatical *κρατεῖν* is approved in the note, yet 'hold fast' appears in the text. It is more surprising to find *γεννηθῆναι*, at p. 33, rendered that He was 'begotten after the flesh,' where the sense requires 'born,' as Aubert has 'natum.' In some places (*e.g.* pp. 10, 20, 231, 232) we find 'man' where 'a man' is required (as elsewhere it is given) to bring out the Nestorian idea; *ἀνθρωπότης* is not always rendered 'manhood,' but sometimes 'human nature,' which does not exactly represent S. Cyril's phrase, and *ἀποφαίνω* is sometimes (*e.g.* pp. 56, 227) taken for 'to manifest,' where it really means to make or render. 'A God-clad man' is not a good rendering of *θεοφόρος*, nor 'Spirit-clad' of *πνευματοφόρος*, nor 'divine' of *θεσπέσιος*, nor 'bare' of *γυμνός*, as used for the unincarnate Word. One more point we must notice; at p. 196 we read,

'The divine Paul says that *great is the mystery of godliness*. And this is true, for the Word was manifested in the flesh, since He is God.'

We do not understand why this rendering is given, since in Mr. Pusey's edition we find, 'Divinus Paulus magnum quidem ait esse mysterium pietatis *ὅς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*, et vere ita se res habet; manifestatus est enim in carne, cum sit Deus Verbum. . . . ' The old Latin version is here, apparently, rather a paraphrase, although the context shows that Cyril wrote, 'for He is God the Word.' But why did not Mr. Pusey translate the Greek as far as he had it, 'Who was manifested,' &c. (as Cyril reads in *Explan.* c. 2; *Ad Pulcheriam*, &c. p. 297, Pusey, &c.)? His version departs from the Greek without adhering to the Latin.

It is a pleasure to turn to the notes, which, as we have said, indicate a truly theological if not a critical mind, and abound in Cyrilline learning. We only wish there were more of them, so that the text might have been still more fully illustrated from S. Cyril's other writings in the controversy. Especially valuable are the comments on *ἐνώσις* and *συναφεία* (pp. 19, 85), on Apollinarianism (pp. 43, 363), on the

VOL. XV.—NO. XXX.

U

standpoint of Theodoret and other 'Easterns' (pp. 33, 43, 128), on resemblances to the Formulary of Reunion in S. Cyril's earlier writings (p. 40), on his careful exclusion of the notion of a 'change in the Word's Godhead at the Incarnation' (p. 232), on his explanation of the phrase, 'one incarnate φύσις' (p. 265), on the theology of Diodore and Theodore (pp. 320, 324). There are good short notes at pp. 73, 83, on the theological sense of *οἰκονομία* as the arrangement or plan for the benefit of God's 'household' which was carried out by our Lord's coming in the flesh; and we are the more surprised that Mr. Pusey should have given 'economically' as a real rendering of S. Cyril's *οἰκονομικῶς*.

There are some peculiarities in the use or non-use of initial capitals, and a too general deficiency in punctuation. The reader has again and again to be, as it were, supplying commas. The index is very elaborate, but would be clearer if so many references were not massed together under the head of 'God the Son.' We notice one inexact reference: 'Scripture . . . proclaims Mary Mother of God, 239.' S. Cyril knew as well as we do that Scripture does not so 'proclaim' her; and what he says in the passage referred to is that Nestorius 'all but bids farewell to Scripture, and says that the holy Virgin is not Theotocos.'

We conclude with a remark on that one world-famous title, the watchword of the momentous Cyrilline struggle and the œcumenical symbol of faith in a Divine Christ. 'Theotocos' has been correctly Latinized into 'Deipara;' but can it be said to have found a precise equivalent in English? If it is too much to say, in the words of the present Bishop of S. David's, that 'the common rendering, Mother of God, introduces a new element of thought,'¹ we must, at any rate, feel that the Greek term, by its very form and sound, gives prominence to the Divinity of Him who, as Man, was born of Mary; whereas the English phrase begins, so to speak, at the other end, and lays greater stress on the supremely privileged Motherhood. The doctrinal intention is the same in both cases, but the impression produced is not identical. Nor can it be denied that, save to a theologically instructed ear, the fuller phrase is more exacting, at first, than S. Paul's language as to 'God's own blood' in Acts xx. 28, not only because it is more abrupt, but because it seems to assert a derivative dependence of 'God' on a human creature, and the mind has to go over certain points of faith in order to define the

¹ Bishop Jones's *Sermons on the Peace of God*, p. 202. 'Mater Dei,' however, is as old as S. Ambrose, and Facundus insists upon it.

true scope of the expression. For all this, the phrase is, for English-speaking Christians, the only practical representative of 'Theotocos'; and we must do the best with it that we can. To use it popularly, without due accompanying safeguards, would, as things are, be to court misconception; but with such a paraphrase as that in the first Reformed Liturgy, 'Mother of Jesus Christ our Lord and God,' or with such an explanation as that 'the Son of God took our nature upon Him by being born of the Virgin, while He continued to be God,' the phrase will assist in the luminous presentation of that supremely precious truth—as precious, we believe, to Theodoret as to Cyril, Celestine, or Proclus—that we live by the faith of an Infinite and Adorable Redeemer.

ART. II.—ANDERSON'S EARLY CHRISTIAN REMAINS IN SCOTLAND.

Scotland in Early Christian Times. By JOSEPH ANDERSON.
2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1881-1882.)

FOR the last half-century the Church has been witnessing, as it still may witness, the gradual revelation of that portion of her history which is graven on the ecclesiastical monuments of Great Britain and Ireland, and which is told by the ruins of her island monasteries, anchorite cells, pre-Norman churches, sculptured stones, High crosses, books, miniature paintings, and reliquaries. Through the labours of Mr. Anderson, Rhind Lecturer in Archæology in Edinburgh, we may now become familiar with the typical forms of ecclesiastical and secular art in North Britain and in the Orkney and Shetland Islands, which bear witness to the vitality of the early institutions of Scotland and to the energy and devotion of her first Christian teachers.

In a case where the antiquities of three regions are so closely related as those of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, we could wish that the investigators who carry on their respective studies in any one of these three countries would adopt a similar method of arrangement in their examples. Contrary to the practice of the Irish school, who, by tracing signs of gradual development, aim at a chronological arrangement of their

series, Mr. Anderson defines 'archæology' as the elucidation, not of date or duration, but of sequence and area, in special classes of remains. He instructs us by 'ascending instead of descending the stream of time,' and, choosing the twelfth century as the starting-point, he works back from the known to the unknown.

The opposite method adopted by the Irish school is more in harmony with that of the Commendatore de Rossi and M. Le Blant when dealing with the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Gaul. These archæologists, working in far wider fields, have discovered laws which they, and, we think, all future epigraphists, may apply with confidence to the formation of a chronological classification of Christian inscriptions. The first step is to place in regular order the series of dated inscriptions, to serve afterwards as starting-points for the future classification of undated ones. In like manner all monuments may with more or less success be grouped beside such dated examples as show like characteristics in form and ornament.

If we reverse Mr. Anderson's arrangement of the antiquities of Scotland and attempt to follow the opposite method, we seem to arrive at a result of no little interest and importance when we connect the gradual development and influx of foreign characteristics in art with the historical events that might be expected to influence the growth of the fine arts. Beginning in the fourth century, we have the massive boulder of unhewn stone, with its inscription, in debased Roman capitals, to Vetta, which stands on a ridge formed by the junction of the rivers Gogar and Almond, about six miles from Edinburgh. This stone Sir James Simpson has attempted to identify as the tombstone of the grandfather of Hengist and Horsa. Later on we come to the illuminated manuscript called the Lindisfarne Gospels, bearing the autograph of Eadfrith, bishop of Lindisfarne between the years 693 to 721. Between the fifth and the seventh centuries Columba has brought Christianity from Ireland to Iona, Ninian has come from the great school of S. Martin at Tours, and the first Roman mission has arrived at Thanet. Ninian, preaching to the Picts between the Firth of Forth and the Grampians, erects in Galloway a church in honour of S. Martin, by aid of masons brought from Tours; and between 563 and 597 we learn that King Brude, near Inverness, was converted by S. Columba. Already three separate influences are at work in Scotland, each of which might be expected to set its stamp on the monuments of the time. Then the great school of Lindisfarne is established, and Eanfleda, wife of Oswy, who

has been
her mar

Man
of this
paramou
to close
Columb
of Hy, v
bell-hou
two insc
to quest
king D
850; a
the dau
element
fluences
Culdees
transfer
draws;
confirm
king S
Danish
Bishop
have re
fluences
Breachin
place w
dinavia
the reig
second
the lat
history
in Eng
yet see
in the
'Greek
to have
vied w
cious g
to St.
strange
Scots
south;
and fo
were w

has been educated in Kent, introduces many changes after her marriage with the King of Northumbria.

Many illuminated manuscripts bear witness to the culture of this period, and one codex, though not illuminated, is of paramount interest, from the fact that its date can be fixed to close on the year 700 ; it being a copy made of the *Life of Columba* by Adamnan—a copy written out by Dorbene, abbot of Hy, who died A.D. 713. In 727 the round church tower or bell-house of Abernethy was begun, and in the next century are two inscribed monuments whose date there can be no reason to question : the stone inscribed to the memory of the Pictish king Drosten, son of Ferat, who was slain by the Scots in 850 ; and the stone in Bressay erected to the memory of the daughter of the Viking Natdodd. A large Scandinavian element is now introduced in the country, while Celtic influences are dying out. Owing to Danish influences the Culdees grew lax in discipline. The seat of the primacy was transferred from Iona to Dunkeld, from Dunkeld to St. Andrews ; and the first bishop, Kellach, went to Rome to be confirmed circ. A.D. 970 to 995. Anlaff, son of the Danish king Sitric, became a Christian circ. 980, being the first Danish chief who was converted. The expedition of Kellach, Bishop of St. Andrews, to Rome, about the same time, must have resulted further in the introduction of many foreign influences. At this time King Kenneth dedicated the city of Brechin to the Lord, and the bell-house or round tower in that place was begun to be erected. Half a century later, both Scandinavian and Roman influences receive fresh impetus during the reign of Malcolm, whose first wife was Ingibiorg, and whose second wife was the great Queen Margaret. His union with the latter marks the commencement of a new era in the history of Scotland. Malcolm's early years had been spent in England, and though uneducated and illiterate himself, he yet seems to have loved and revered learning and religion in the person of his wife Margaret. Her books, though 'Greek to him,' were yet so loved by the King that he is said to have had their covers adorned with gold and jewels, and he vied with her in his munificence to the Church. Many precious gifts were offered to Dunfermline ; additions were made to St. Andrews for the accommodation of pilgrims and strangers from all parts of the earth ; the rude customs of the Scots yielded by degrees to the higher civilization of the south ; merchants were invited from different countries abroad, and found a ready sale for their goods. And many reforms were wrought in the Church by aid of English ecclesiastics,

while Margaret is said to have spoken in counsel for three days herself, maintaining 'with the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God,' the cause of opposition to the usages and abuses which prevailed in Scotland. We see no reason to doubt that the buildings of the round tower of Brechin and Thorfinn's Christ Kirk in the Orkney Islands are standing monuments of this time; just as the monastery founded on Inchcolm by Alexander in 1123, and the tower of S. Regulus at St. Andrews, are the evidences of fresh influences at work in the reigns of her sons Alexander and David.

At the close of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century the Scottish Church discarded many peculiarities of its earlier system, and, yielding to the influences of the Cistercian and Augustinian canons, was gradually assimilated to the Church of southern Britain. We may learn something of the changes wrought in the spirit and feeling for art during these centuries by comparing the stones of Natdodd's daughter and Drosten with the shaft of Lachlan's cross at Iona, with its griffin tail running into a continuous pattern of leafy scroll-work, as well as those at Kilkerran, Campbellton, and Inverary.

It must, however, be allowed that, in dealing with the monuments of Scotland, those which may be regarded as landmarks from which to infer the dates of others are singularly few. It is only by availing ourselves of the labours of the Irish school, and their master, George Petrie, that conclusions may be arrived at as to the periods of the Celtic remains in Scotland. This is fully acknowledged by Mr. Anderson.¹ 'Neither the history nor the remains of the early Christian period in Scotland,' he observes, 'can be studied apart from those in Ireland.' In dealing with the monastic ruins on the islands of the west coast of Scotland he is first compelled to quote the descriptions given by Petrie and Lord Dunraven of the corresponding remains in Ireland, since 'we have no such complete or characteristic groups in Scotland.' Passing from the first churches built with cement, and with or without chancels, to the primitive dry-stone buildings, he says:—

'To learn the special features of that earliest style of Christian construction we must look to Ireland, the ancient Scotia, where the genius of the people, their immemorial customs, their language and institutions, were so similar to those of our own country that, when the new faith was finally established by the labours of her missionaries, the converts accepted with it the ecclesiastical customs, constitution, and usages already established there.'

¹ Vol. i. p. 76.

The t
'strag
It fol
and p
eviden
that t
by the

Agai
concl
the H
to th
high
at an

S
antiq
corre
natur
quiti
the
anch
Irela
islan
tops
just
west
moun
gart,
Lee
herm

V
Mr. A
centu
of fo
Ardr
type
beau
ward
Tow
Rom
Dun
no si
of 't
Glen

The towers of Brechin and Abernethy are, he says again—

‘stragglers from a great typical group which has its *habitat* in Ireland. It follows from this, that all questions as to the origin, purpose, and period of the type must be discussed with reference to the evidence derived from the investigation of the principal group, and that the general conclusions drawn from the extended data furnished by the many in Ireland must also hold good for the few in Scotland.’¹

Again, when dealing with the sculptured stones, he allows the conclusions of George Petrie and his school as to the date of the High crosses, which range from the beginning of the tenth to the middle of the twelfth century, and assumes that the higher phase of sculpture in relief was developed in Ireland at an earlier period than in Scotland.

Seeing, then, the high value set by Mr. Anderson on Irish antiquities, we are sure of his forgiveness if we attempt to correct one or two trifling errors of statement, such as might naturally fall from anyone not long familiar with the antiquities of that country. At page 93, vol. i., when treating of the earliest type of Christian buildings in Scotland—the anchorite cells and monasteries—he remarks: ‘Here, *as in Ireland*, it is only on the smaller uninhabited and inaccessible islands that we find such traces.’ But, as a fact, the mountain-tops and the islands in the mountain tarns of Ireland offer just as striking examples of anchorite establishments as do her western islands. Slieve Donard, Slieve Liag, S. Brendan’s mountain, are still crowned by the beehive cells of Doman-gart, and Aed, the son of Bric, and Brendan; while in Loch Lee in Kerry, and Gougane Barra in Cork, may be seen the hermitages of S. Finan and S. Finbar.

With regard to the ecclesiastical round towers of Ireland, Mr. Anderson is quite mistaken in his idea that in the twelfth century this form was ‘dying out by a species of degradation of form and function’; whereas the truth (as witnessed by Ardmore and Annadown, built A.D. 1203–1238) is that the type was developing, just as in Italy, into one of greater beauty and power. In the series of examples he brings forward to prove his statement he first mentions S. Finan’s Tower at Clonmacnois—a very perfect example of Irish Romanesque, attached to a highly ornamented church; also Dungiven, another enriched Romanesque building, showing no signs of degradation; and then he names as an example of ‘the final stage of degradation’ the church of S. Kevin at Glendalough, a building that there is every reason to believe

¹ Vol. i. p. 48.

is of the same date as the stone-roofed church of Columba at Kells, *i.e.* A.D. 807. He thinks there is still proof wanting that this type of tower reached Ireland from Italy, and denies that the first church towers, and those which resemble the Irish in form, were 'isolated like the Irish towers.' Both in Ireland and Italy these towers were always built beside churches; therefore in neither country were they isolated, but they were almost invariably detached, whether at home or abroad; and the Ravenna towers possess the character of *safes*, or places of security, quite as much as those of Ireland. Altogether Mr. Anderson scarcely gives Ravenna the rank she deserves as a cradle of much of our early Christian art and architecture.

Nothing strikes us as more curious, when comparing the antiquities of Ireland and Scotland, than the small number of Christian sepulchral monuments in Scotland, and the rarity of sepulchral inscriptions, as contrasted with Ireland. While Ireland has already given us 244 tombstones with inscriptions in the vernacular, Scotland can only boast the stones of Vetta, son of Victus, and of Drost, son of 'Ferat, on the mainland, and five from Iona, of a decidedly Irish type. While Ireland yields already some hundred Ogham inscriptions, Scotland only gives four on the mainland and seven on the Orkney and Shetland Islands. The Ogham stones of Scotland are enriched with profuse sculpture in relief, while in Ireland they seem to be always of a much ruder and earlier type, indeed almost quite devoid of ornament.

The stone monuments of Ireland are of three kinds: landmarks, terminal crosses, and tombstones—the latter being always slabs laid flat on the ground. The terminal crosses, or High crosses, occur in Scotland, and erect slabs seem to take the place of the landmarks or pillar-stones of Ireland. These slabs are shaped to a regular form, enriched on both sides with profuse decoration, such as the uninterpreted symbols, human figures, animals, interlacings, and other designs.

With the sculptured stones of Scotland we arrive at that which we feel to be the crowning feature in Mr. Anderson's work, the method by which he seems to have solved the problem as to the origin and intention of a large class of those strange figures and symbols which are found on upright slabs within a certain area on the east of Scotland. In Mr. Anderson's hands archæology has indeed advanced since the time when Boece, writing at the close of the fifteenth century, suggests that these forms are cyphers, or a system of secret writing used on tombs; when others held them to be

Phoe
year
(vol.
on th
amon
neigh
num
astic
been
comm
sepu

M
two
but
puta
repre
two
be a
an a
and

T
four
lizar
sour
heter
foll
chap
take
Brita
or F
spiri
form
whic
strat
Scot
may
furth
wide
and
Pyr
esca
by t
lions
host

Phœnician, and others Gnostic. Even Mr. Stuart but twenty years ago observed, 'These symbols must be of Pictish origin (vol. ii. p. 34), since the Picts are said to have painted animals on their bodies,' quite ignoring the fact that they do not occur among the monuments of this people any more than in the neighbourhood of churches of Scotie foundation. The greater number of monuments on which they appear are not ecclesiastical, but secular; only twenty-five out of sixty-nine have been found near churches. They may be monumental, and commemorative of some historic event, but are very rarely sepulchral.

Mr. Anderson divides the symbols on these stones into two classes, by one of which he confesses himself still baffled; but those of the other class he proves, and we think indisputably, to be variants from a parent system of symbolic representation. To the first belong signs, such as the crescent, two circles joined by a hand, a zigzag form, a form that may be a conventional lily, another that may stand for a book, an animal's head, a large circle with a smaller at each side, and so on. These symbols do not occur in Ireland.

The second class consists of a mirror, a comb, dragons, four-footed animals with gaping jaws, elephants, hogs, fish, lizards, long rows of wild beasts, stags, birds, &c. To what source can we trace the origin and meaning of carving such heterogeneous forms on our monuments? Mr. Anderson follows the clue given him by Mr. John Evans in the first chapter of his description of the early British coins.¹ He could take no better guide. In the early coinages of Gaul and Britain we find that the successive copyists of some fine Greek or Roman original, departing further and further from the spirit and form of the prototypes, at last developed typical forms which are intelligible only when the series of steps by which the degraded form was reached have been demonstrated. So was it with the rude stone-cutters in the east of Scotland. Their work is the degenerate form whose prototype may be traced back to the first Christian sarcophagi, and even further; for the early Christian artists allowed themselves wide latitude in the use of Pagan images. They made Genii and Amorini; they adopted the figure of Deucalion and Pyrrha in a box, with two doves, for Noah in the ark; Jason escaping from the sea monster's mouth for Jonah cast forth by the whale. Of the purely Christian subjects, Daniel in the lions' den, the raising of Lazarus, the destruction of Pharaoh's host in the Red Sea, the ascension of Elijah, are here given

¹ See *Early British Coinage*, p. 27.

in beautiful examples, drawn from the Vatican Codex, from sarcophagi at Arles, and Ravenna, and Velletri. But how amazing is the interest of seeing such examples of Italian art of the fourth and fifth centuries brought face to face, as they are in Mr. Anderson's illustrations, with their rude and hitherto incomprehensible copies on the High crosses at Kells and Moone Abbey and Iona, on the stone at St. Vigean, or that brought to Abbotsford from Woodwray, on a sculptured stone at St. Andrews, and others at Dunkeld and Meikle. Rude indeed as are these Irish and Scottish versions of the old stereotyped subjects of Byzantine art, they are not half so wide a departure from their prototypes as is the British coin found at Pickering, in Yorkshire, in 1853, from the coin of Philip the Second of Macedon, to which Mr. Evans has traced its origin. 'It is difficult,' he observes, 'to imagine more barbarous art than is found on this coin; nor can we well conceive a type in which the noble laureate head and spirited biga, on the Macedonian prototype, are more completely degenerated, and indeed entirely forgotten, than in this with which the series I have attempted to describe concludes.' The usual variations from the prototype in the series of British and Gaulish coins alluded to are as follows:—The face has been to some measure preserved, but vulgarized; the outline of the head has been destroyed, the hair conventionalized, reduced to a formal system of lines, the front locks appear as three open crescents, the curls and laurel wreath are reduced to a meaningless symmetrical pattern, while a hook stands for the beautiful curve of the ear. On the reverse the biga has entirely disappeared, while the four horses have melted into one. The original was probably seen by the Gauls when Brennus plundered Greece, B.C. 279. And for four centuries after, copies more and more degraded were multiplied as the type travelled northward, till all resemblance to the original disappeared.

In the Middle-age Bestiaries, as well as in the writings of the Fathers, Mr. Anderson traces the meaning and origin of many of the strange groups of animals on our stones. 'The stag is said to know where the serpent has its den, and, filling its mouth with water, floods the den; the serpent is driven forth, and the stag tramples it to death. The stag is therefore the symbol of Christ.'¹ This reminds us of a passage in the writings of Isidorus.²

'When the lioness has brought forth the cub she is said to sleep during three days, until by the sound of the father's roar, which

¹ *Spicilegium Solesmense*, I. cap. ix. 21.

² *Étymol.* lib. xii. cap. ii. n. 3, 4, etc.

causes her sleeping-place as it were to tremble, she rouses the sleeping cub ; so Christ, when he had given us birth upon the cross, slept during three days, until the great movement of the earth was made, and he was roused in the blessed Resurrection.' 'Again,' we read, 'the lioness brings forth her cubs dead, and watches over them during three days, until the father comes and breathes into their faces, and they come to life ; so when the three days were ended—from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Moses, from Moses to the Maccabees—at that time came the Father of all, Christ, who breathes by his sacred teaching into their faces, and brings them to life.'¹

This subject is one of the motives used by Giotto to signify the raising of man from the dead. How strangely interesting it is then to find it one of the subjects on a stone at Dunfallandy, in Perthshire, and in the space above the arm of the cross at Shandwick, in Ross-shire!

But Giotto! The name sounds as a bell ringing in the advent of a higher, fuller life than any we can find in Byzantine, Celtic, or Scandinavian art. With this master we enter on a path where mind and heart can expand ; we cast aside convention, vain repetition of forms 'through which the spirit breathes no more,' lifeless symmetry, and stereotyped ideals,

'And paint man, man—whatever the issue !²
Make the hopes shine through the flesh they fray.'

And side by side with such development in the historical art of Italy was the advance in decorative art. Ornament became the expression of man's delight in God's work, and designs drawn from natural forms took the place of spirals, knots, and patterns.

We cannot, therefore, quite sympathize with Mr. Anderson when he claims for the monuments of early Christian times in Scotland a place as models of intrinsic value and suggestiveness for our designers, sculptors, and jewellers in the present day, and discovers in them evidences of culture, of imagi-

¹ See also in Middle-Irish, the facsimile of the *Leabhar Breacc* (or Speckled Book), published by the Royal Irish Academy, p. 167, col. 2, lines 63–68. Literally rendered, this version of the legend is as follows : 'Jacob son of Isaac was the first who prophesied (see Genesis c. xlix. v. 9), when he was foretelling of his son, to wit, of Judah, and said : "This is what I deem Judah like," saith Jacob, "to wit, a lion's whelp. What, who, shall rouse him up ?" for this is the peculiarity (*aiste*) of that whelp, that it is three days in death immediately after its birth. And the male lion comes to it, and puts his breath round it, and roars over it with a great voice, and then raises up the whelp to life. Thus then arose Christ from the dead through the might of the Heavenly Father.'

² Browning, *Men and Women*, vol. ii. p. 39.

nation, and refinement of taste which would furnish a Scottish School of Art in the present day 'with a wealth of material no other nation possesses.'¹ As he himself has proved, the art, consisting of forms of men and animals on the sculptured monuments is a derived system of symbols composed of mere variants of universal types, disguised and degraded in their passage from the higher art of the primitive Church to the later and more local art of the Celtic Church; so is it also with the linear designs, the interlacings and scrolls that form the decorative portion of our art; so is it also with regard to our bell-houses or ecclesiastical towers, our shrines, and crosiers, and chalices. Our so-called Celtic art is a derived system stamped with a native and semi-barbarous character, 'intricate and irksome,' as Mr. Anderson in one place truly terms it, but full of interest, and occasionally beautiful in result.

Yet neither do we sympathize with those writers who find in this so-called Celtic art nothing higher than the art of the savage, nothing better than the carved patterns of the Fiji islanders. So far as we can see, the line to be drawn between the two opinions is this, that our early Christian monuments, covering a period of eight centuries, are of paramount interest as evidences of the gradual entrance of the inhabitants of these islands into the current of European thought and culture, and their ultimate assimilation with the larger, fuller life of continental Europe. Through them we can trace the various influences—Scandinavian, Celtic, Roman—that have gone to moulding our national character, and history will gain much by reading in these monuments how century by century our insular customs yielded to the higher civilization of the South, while yet we retained enough native force to stamp our work with an independent character and strong individuality.

¹ Vol. ii. p. 133.

ART. III.—CARLYLE'S LIFE AND WORKS.

1. *Thomas Carlyle : a History of the First Forty Years of his Life.* 1795-1835. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. (London, 1882.)
2. *Reminiscences by Thomas Carlyle.* Edited by JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. (London, 1881.)
3. *Mr. Carlyle's Works.* People's Edition, 36 vols.
4. *Reminiscences of my Irish Journey in 1849.* By THOMAS CARLYLE. (London, 1882.)

A QUARTERLY REVIEW has many disadvantages as compared with publications that are able to comment more speedily upon passing affairs and subjects of fresh interest ; but it has this advantage, that it can look at such subjects more dispassionately, and is less likely to fall in with the first hasty conclusions of popular feeling. We are especially conscious of this advantage in dealing with such a theme as the life of Mr. Carlyle. For in his case popular feeling has been playing its usual tricks with even more than its usual caprice. For many years before his death it had chosen to set him on a pedestal from which no efforts of his own could dislodge him. He was revered as a prophet, and consulted as an oracle ; the comparative failure of his last great work, the *Life of Frederick*, could no more injure the impression made by his earlier utterances, than could the violence and obstinacy of his declarations on slavery impair the admiration felt for his personal character. Popular feeling had apparently determined to make an idol of this man, and popular feeling must have its way, uncontrolled as usual by the restraints of fact or of logic. But the halo which in his lifetime surrounded the person of the great writer was rudely dispersed after his death ; and, as everyone knows, his reputation seemed to be fatally injured by his own *Reminiscences*. The usual conventional outcry of the English public arose ; the newspapers, whose function it is to guide public opinion whither it wishes to go, swelled the chorus ; and the only question was whether Carlyle was the more to blame for writing, or Mr. Froude for publishing, the offending book. Into that dispute we do not propose to enter, except to say that, in our opinion, Mr. Froude was formally justified in publishing the *Reminiscences* by Carlyle's express

consent given 'a few weeks before' his 'death.'¹ As to the manner in which Mr. Froude has discharged his task we shall have something to say later; in the mere act of the publication, we repeat, we hold him to have been within his right.

The outcry has not, as yet, been diminished by the further revelations contained in Mr. Froude's *History of the First Forty Years of Carlyle's Life*. The reaction which popular feeling invariably goes through has not yet set in, though we may confidently expect it. The two books, on the whole, tally in the impression they give of Carlyle's character, if, that is, in reading the *Reminiscences*, we remember that the writer was an old man bowed down by the weight of a great grief. This has been, we think, to a great extent forgotten by those who joined in the outcry caused by the publication. Still, admitting for the present the substantial accuracy of the representation of Carlyle contained in these books, let us see what we are to say of the clamour which they produced.

Proverbs are always devices for escaping from the trouble of thinking for oneself, and they are very often excuses for refusing to do one's plain duty. Of this kind more especially is the favourite retort of the indolent man of the world to the inconvenient preacher—'Practise what you preach.' 'They may be true and they may be very important, but so long as your own example gives me the smallest loophole for escaping from the strictness of your precepts, I need not listen to them.' That is the usual meaning of the saying; and we cannot help thinking that it has been strikingly exemplified in the world's treatment of Carlyle. A lofty moralist, a stern and vehement reprobator of all that is base and conventional, a persistent despiser of the common littlenesses of life, Carlyle was naturally most unpalatable to the mass of men. His very existence in the midst of English society in the nineteenth century was, as it were, a standing declaration against the principles and practice of a great part of that society. It was with something of alacrity, then, with an odd kind of relief, that, in the *Reminiscences*, people saw the desired loophole, the opportunity for applying their favourite proverb. The preacher had not practised, or at least it suited us to say so. He was evidently censorious, almost calumnious; he was envious, discontented, selfish; he made much of the small and inevitable troubles of life, in spite of his own repeated

¹ *Life*, vol. i. p. 14. The words 'Mrs. Carlyle' in this passage (line 2) are an obvious misprint for 'Mr. Carlyle.'

exho
throu
man,
once
from
his v
thing
about
very
was;
to at
bow'
feelin
old c
indee
their
fault-
scarce
repro
books
temp
judgm
accus
exagg
so ob
so de
page
has n
a goo
are al
includ
We a
out t
Carly
at lea
herd
limits
No w
of a n
and v
shoul
heard
remor
with
chara

exhortations to his readers to face them and go boldly through them; in short, he was a thoroughly disagreeable man, with quite as much of human infirmity as any of his once reverential disciples, and the world may be dispensed from listening to what he had to say, and need adopt none of his very embarrassing principles. Has there not been something, at least, of this unconscious relief in the popular feeling about Carlyle since his death? The moralists we like are very seldom so stern, and unbending, and unworldly as he was; it was a continual strain to listen to him, a still greater to attempt to do what he taught, and now that the 'broken bow' has succeeded in 'starting aside,' there is a certain feeling of contentment and comfort in the escape from the old constrained attitude of mind. So great is this feeling, indeed, that men have hardly noticed that they have founded their sweeping accusation of Carlyle almost entirely on one fault—an obvious fault, it is true, and a serious fault, but scarcely sufficient as the basis of the whole structure of reprobation. The one point no one can overlook in these books is the harsh and contemptuous judgments of his contemporaries, and the very vigorous language in which those judgments are expressed. There are other matters of accusation—his apparently selfish treatment of his wife, his exaggeration of small evils, for example; but these are not so obvious or so important as the perpetual scorn of others so definitely and witheringly pronounced on almost every page of his *Reminiscences* or his journal. The general reader has not been able to overlook this. The one *sine quâ non* of a good man in our time is good humour; the only virtue we are all prepared to enforce is a sort of easy benevolence that includes everybody in a general verdict of unmeaning praise. We are terribly afraid of speaking out, especially of speaking out the truth, when it is likely to injure anyone's feelings. Carlyle is describing a class, or rather a whole generation, in at least the latter half of his portrait of the Ettrick Shepherd: 'his intellect seems of the weakest; his morality also limits itself to the precept "Be not angry"' (*Life*, ii. 234). No wonder, then, that on looking into the private thoughts of a man whose grand characteristic was clearness of insight, and whose chief failing was exaggeration of expression, we should be startled to find men of whom we have usually heard nothing but slightly insipid good described with remorseless accuracy and unsparing vigour, standing out with all their faults, whether of appearance, manner, or character, in the fierce light of Carlyle's deep-piercing eyes.

It is startling, and we would not be thought to underrate the unpleasantness of it; nor do we wish by any means to praise Carlyle for his habit of derogatory speech. We shall have more to say of this later; at present we would only point out that such a shock is not always an unmixed evil. It may awaken us to the fact that the principle '*de mortuis et vivis nil nisi bonum*' is not always good and sufficient for a practical rule of life; that truth, in however strange and harsh a form, is at times a necessary element in history, even in contemporary history; and that the shrinking from the man who speaks out may be as much a sign of moral cowardice as of Christian charity. Carlyle's life has other lessons to teach than the mere fact that he was, as Mr. Froude is never tired of reminding us, 'gey ill to live wi'; and it is surely a pity that for the present this impression should have overpowered all others in the popular mind. For on the whole, as we hope to be able to show, it was a noble life; disfigured, like many other noble lives, by weaknesses and faults, but still noble and full of much that is most lacking in men of our time.

First, however, we must say something of the way in which Mr. Froude has done his work. We must own to being very greatly disappointed with the merely literary execution of it. Even the grammar is at times bad, and shows signs of slovenly haste in the preparation of the book, and this is confirmed by the perpetual and wearisome repetitions of the same thoughts and phrases. Mr. Froude has not taken the trouble to condense what he has to say; his various descriptions of Carlyle's character are merely so many attempts to say the same thing, and instead of selecting the best attempt, and giving us that alone, he presents us with all, good, bad, and indifferent. One has the feeling of never gaining ground, and the last pages of the book seem to be occupied with the same points as were the first. Still worse than this is the confused arrangement, and the repetition of events in Carlyle's life first in Mr. Froude's own language, and then in extracts from the *Reminiscences*. A flagrant instance of this occurs on pp. 16 and 17 of vol. i., where within two pages the same passage of some five lines in length is repeated. It would have been better in every way had Mr. Froude used the *Reminiscences* as materials for the *Life*, instead of confusing our minds with two books covering very much the same ground, of which the first reappears at intervals in the second in a most perplexing manner. He might thus, by publishing only selections from the *Reminiscences*, have avoided the

offer
gave
I
more
it is
sion,
us th
Mr.
almo
a col
made
safin
caus
not
Mr. L
it his
which
name
least,
wilful
the i
Mr. F
ing an
was u
whose
who l
unsyn
attrac
Carly
sided
sets h
indeed
which
great
of his
the ge
that g
rated
to see
contr
therefo
Carlyle
publica

offence and pain which the hasty and unrestricted publication gave to so many.

But these are only literary faults. What we dislike still more in Mr. Froude's book is the tone and temper in which it is written. This is of course a matter of personal impression, and others may fail to perceive what we mean; but to us there is something extremely repulsive in the way in which Mr. Froude portrays his friend, exaggerating, as he himself almost owns (ii. 470), the characteristic faults, repeating, with a cold disdain for the feelings of others, the scathing comments made by Carlyle in private on his acquaintances, and vouchsafing no word of apology or of regret, in spite of the outcry caused by the publication of the *Reminiscences*. If we do not blame Carlyle for his harsh judgments, we do blame Mr. Froude for publishing them; or, at least, if he thought it his duty to publish them, we blame him for the way in which he has done it. He might in many cases have left names blank; he has seldom done this, and in two cases, at least, where he has tried to prevent identification, he has either wilfully or with surprising clumsiness betrayed the secret by the immediate context.¹ But we cannot help thinking that Mr. Froude takes a sort of contemptuous pleasure in displaying and emphasizing the outbursts of passion to which Carlyle was undoubtedly subject. He reminds us of a showman whose pride it is to stir up the lions and make them roar, and who looks at the mingled emotions of the spectator with an unsympathetic and passionless interest that is singularly unattractive. We have reason to believe that the impression of Carlyle given by the *Reminiscences* was, to say the least, one-sided and incorrect; but it is this impression that Mr. Froude sets himself to emphasize and increase in the *Life*. There are indeed passages of great truth and much beauty of tone, in which he gives the counterbalancing facts, and points out the great qualities that in reality overpowered the surface faults of his friend; but there can be no doubt that, on the whole, the general idea we take from reading the *Life* is the same as that given by the *Reminiscences*, which, we repeat, is exaggerated and partial. If one reads carefully, it is not difficult to see in Mr. Froude's own pages abundant evidence to the contrary; but few people do read carefully, and the result, therefore, of the book is to perpetuate a popular opinion of Carlyle which was generated by the premature and isolated publication of the *Reminiscences*, and ought to have been cor-

¹ See *Life*, i. pp. 303, 307; ii. pp. 117, 120.

rected and mitigated by those who knew him best. But his reputation has been left in the hands of one who, apparently by preference, dwells on the violent weaknesses and intemperate melancholy of the great writer, and who at times even strains his words in order to prove him morose and malevolent. A more unfounded and ill-natured comment, for instance, than that on Carlyle's account of Jeffrey, we have seldom read: 'Carlyle was evidently trying to think as well as he could about his *great* friend, and was not altogether succeeding.'¹ There is literally no truth in this insinuation: the passage is a very favourable though discriminating account of a man who differed fundamentally from Carlyle, but whose goodness and brightness Carlyle could see and describe with most ungrudging generosity. 'On the whole,' he ends, 'he is about the *best man* I ever saw.' Mr. Froude's comment is a deliberate attempt to keep up the unfavourable impression of Carlyle. Again, the whole story of Carlyle's marriage and relations with his wife is, so far as we can see, exaggerated and darkened by Mr. Froude. We do not wish to say that the marriage was an ideally happy one; but it is impossible to read the letters written by both husband and wife without seeing that there was in these two fine natures a strong foundation of enduring love, capable of resisting much more than the sharp words and passionate outbursts to which both were liable. To judge between man and wife is proverbially difficult, and we cannot say that in the rest of the book Mr. Froude has shown that delicacy of taste and perception which alone could qualify him for success in this department of his task.

However, leaving Mr. Froude, let us turn to the life and character of the great writer, as they are revealed to us in his own letters and journals. After all, not much harm has been done. There may have been a mistaken selection of materials; the letters and extracts may represent too exclusively the darker side of Carlyle's outpourings; but there is enough in these volumes to show us a singularly rich and powerful character, whose qualities can by no means be summed up in one antithetical phrase, or even fully appreciated by any one mind. We would try and put together the more important traits of this character as they have struck us, keeping before our minds the fact that we are standing, as it were, beneath the object of our contemplation, and can only imperfectly see it. We are too close to it and too much below it to judge quite accurately.

¹ Vol. ii. p. 127.

1885
side
first
has
know
inde
show
true
circu
part
He w
of so
him.
were
of th
impo
prom
see in
rever
all tri
ideal
Streng
herita
life th
to him
The C
renunc
of God
renunc
to rem
the du
one ob
Carlyle
Wo
great fe
unconsc
believed
than for
arose fr
pelled t
of word
ation to
and eve
unless t
writing

In estimating a man's life, there are two things to be considered, his ideal, and his conformity to his ideal. For the first a man is only in part responsible; as for the second, he has only himself to blame if he fails to come up to what he knows to be the right standard of life. Circumstances may indeed hamper and confine a man's action; but no one has shown more nobly than Carlyle in many passages how the true hero rises supreme and reaches his ideal in spite of circumstances. Carlyle's ideal of what is right was in great part the natural ideal of a stern, God-fearing Scottish peasant. He was brought up in a life of hardship and toil: so the duty of sound and honest work was among the first impressed upon him. His ancestors, and especially his father and mother, were admirable specimens of the strong believing Calvinists of the North, in whose eyes God's will is the one matter of importance in this world, who are therefore rigid and uncompromising and true to the manifestations of that will that they see in the world of fact. Carlyle was therefore brought up to reverence facts, to cling to the truth in everything, to despise all trifles, and to hate falsehood. The main elements of his ideal of goodness he brought with him into the world. Strength, honesty, industry, reverence, truth, these were his heritage, and we can see that to these he did conform his whole life through. One virtue only, so far as we can judge, came to him later, and his grasp of it was proportionately weak. The Calvinist temper does not seem to have included self-renunciation as a real part of the Christian life. To the will of God, indeed, man must utterly submit himself; so far self-renunciation was recognized; but to deny oneself for others, to remember the brotherhood of man, seems to be no part of the duty of life for those who are taught to think that their one object is the salvation of their own souls. Nevertheless, Carlyle learnt this also, but he learnt it late in life.

Work, and truth, and reverence are, we should say, the great features of Carlyle's character that stand out in his own unconscious portrait of himself. Mr. Froude says that he believed himself to have 'perhaps less capability for literature than for any other occupation,' and that part of his discontent arose from his being debarred from a life of action, and compelled to take to an occupation of mere speaking and writing, of words, not deeds. Still more noble, then, is his determination to carry his principle of good work into every article and every book that he undertook. Few can understand, unless they have known it, the temptation to a man who is writing for his bread to scamp his work, to write thoughtlessly

and untruly, to catch the passing fancy, instead of speaking only the message that has been entrusted to him. Carlyle was a grand instance of the man who chose the harder part, who, as Mr. Froude well says,

'had imposed conditions upon himself which might make the very keeping himself alive impossible ; for his function was sacred to him, and he had laid down as a fixed rule that he would never write merely to please, never for money ; that he would never write anything save when specially moved to write by an impulse from within ; above all, never to set down a sentence which he did not in his heart believe to be true, and to spare no labour till his work to the last fibre was as good as he could possibly make it.'

And however contemptuous he might be of the work of writing, compared with manual labour, yet it was very real work. How many Quarterly Reviewers are there who would prepare themselves for an article by reading 'twenty-five octavo volumes' through? Yet Carlyle did this conscientiously for his essay on Diderot.

In all this honest industry and exactness Carlyle was but carrying out the lessons he had learnt from the precepts and, above all, from the example of his father. There are few more touching records in literature than his *Reminiscences of James Carlyle, of Ecclefechan, Mason* ; and in this record perhaps the leading thought is the excellence and soundness of the work that his father accomplished :—

'The force that had been lent my father he honourably expended in manful well-doing. A portion of this planet bears beneficent traces of his strong hand and strong head. Nothing that he undertook but he did it faithfully and like a true man. I shall look on the houses he built with a certain proud interest. They stand firm and sound to the heart all over his little district. No one that comes after him will ever say, Here was the finger of a hollow eye-servant. They are little texts for me of the gospel of man's freewill.'

Carlyle thus handed on to us what he had received from the generations before him ; and how useful, and indeed necessary, it is for us to learn this lesson of honest work, none knew or have expressed more clearly than he. It is right to remember that the amazing objurgations of bad work which are so frequent in the *Reminiscences* and elsewhere are the expressions of a genuine and deep-seated feeling, though exaggerated, like all Carlyle's feelings, by the great energy of his metaphorical language. And in this point, at least, what he fiercely blamed in others he would never give way to himself : no writing of his is hasty or inaccurate, and such a work as

the f
appa
later
the g
C
and f
truth
of m
in th
ing a
that
unex
ances
tions
cases
which
that,
what
of suc
strikin
rather
than u
We v
judgm
privat
we fir
Now,
Carly
gerate
his co
dyspep
pathet
are ra
uncon
mitiga
are cl
remem
is in t
shadow
reputa
insight
hopeles
But th
Look,
Jeffrey

the first volume of the *French Revolution*, rewritten with no apparent loss of vigour or truth of detail, should be to all later writers what his father's houses were to him, a 'text of the gospel of man's freewill.'

Carlyle's love of good work was based on a still deeper and nobler instinct in his nature, his steadfast adherence to truth. On this point we shall, we fear, go against the opinions of many of our readers, of those especially who have joined in the popular outcry against the *Reminiscences*. For, leaving aside the habitual exaggeration of language, we believe that for the most part the outcry was caused by the totally unexpected and unprecedented truthfulness of Carlyle's utterances about his contemporaries. Mistakes and misrepresentations have been pointed out in the *Reminiscences*, but in many cases they should be set down to the state of mind in which the greater part of that unhappy book was written, so that, as Mr. Froude testifies, 'he was afterwards unconscious what he had done.' To take the 'wild and whirling words' of such writings, and to generalize from them exclusively, is a striking instance of the tendency in human nature to debase rather than exalt, to think upon the evil that is in men rather than upon 'whatsoever things are lovely and of good report.' We will not take the *Reminiscences* as Carlyle's typical judgments of the men of his time. But, it will be said, in his private letters and in his journals as we read them in the *Life* we find the same evilspeaking and contemptuous abuse. Now, with some very few exceptions, we should deny this. Carlyle's descriptions of others are, as we have said, exaggerated and harsh in expression; they are coloured by his constitutional melancholy and by the added gloom of dyspepsia, and in some cases they are hopelessly unsympathetic. But, speaking generally, they are true; they are rarely even one-sided, and we should not mistake an unconventional openness of praise as well as blame for unmitigated blame. Where both sides of a man's character are clearly and vigorously portrayed, one is very apt to remember only the shadows; but we doubt whether there is in the *Life* any portrait, except one, which is entirely shadow. The exception, a most harmful one for Carlyle's reputation, is, of course, Charles Lamb. Here Carlyle's insight was darkened by his prejudices, and the result is a hopeless misunderstanding and a painful misrepresentation. But this, which has been so dwelt upon, is an isolated case. Look, on the other hand, at his many striking estimates of Jeffrey's very uncongenial character, especially at the well-

balanced judgment to which we have already referred ; look at the ungrudging praise of Allan Cunningham, of Leigh Hunt, of Charles Buller, or of John Mill, all of them very different men in opinions and in character from Carlyle, and yet praised and judged with great generosity as well as accuracy. For, we must repeat it, the foundation of all his judgments is truth ; and those for which he has been most blamed will often be found the truest. The portraits are so startling in their piercing veracity and life, the men are 'hit off' with such vigour and reality, that the effect upon one who admires them is sometimes that of an unexpected cold bath. It is not often that one whom we have learnt to love and admire in his writings is quite able to maintain his position when we see him in person ; and Carlyle's portraits are singularly lifelike introductions to the persons described. No one, surely, can doubt that in his two descriptions of Coleridge the man is really put before us as he appeared to an observer, competent indeed and appreciative, but not very sympathetic. If Carlyle saw him in that guise, it was better that he should say so than that he should give the world a conventional picture of the great leader of thought. Such a description explains better than many philosophical discourses the comparative failure of Coleridge's life. But it must be noticed that the other side is given faithfully as far as it was possible for Carlyle to give it. And even the summing up in a letter to his brother is, if the habitual picturesqueness of the language be discounted, not an unfair description : 'Coleridge is a mass of richest spices putrefied into a dunghill. I never hear him *tarwle* without feeling ready to worship him, and toss him in a blanket.' Again, if one puts together the three allusions to Macaulay, what an admirable account they are, of course from Carlyle's point of view, of the rising man of the day : 'Of Macaulay I hear nothing very good—a sophistical, rhetorical, ambitious young man of talent.' This is corrected by later impressions : 'an emphatic, hottish, really forcible person, but unhappily without divine idea.' Lastly, 'he has more force and emphasis in him than any other of my British coevals. Wants the root of belief, however. May fail to accomplish much. Let us hope better things.' Taking, as we have said, the three remarks together, and remembering the enormous difference between the two men's characters and beliefs, we maintain that in such a description there is an essential truth. Equally true, or at least not greatly exaggerated, must appear to many the sudden flashes of scorn at two of the literary leaders of the day : 'Rogers an elegant,

poli
trivi
com
own
to th
For,
tions
at w
in lit
Keat
far o
pove
the h
for M
to na
last.
still
whor
'a d
creat
lessn
canc
of le
very
Engl
with
T
his fr
diver
in the
resolu
feelin
tianity
greate
tarian
gave
in the
his o
would
in ad
the pr
and C
of Ca
share
doubt

politely malignant old lady;' and 'Moore . . . a lascivious triviality of great name.' Remembering who Carlyle was in comparison with such men as Rogers and Moore, we must own that these scathing words are not far from the truth as to the men themselves and as to their position in the world. For, in spite of the natural tendency to believe in past generations, it is becoming clear to us that Carlyle came to London at what was in truth almost the low-water mark of this century in literature, as in some other things. Byron, and Shelley, and Keats were dead, Scott was in his decadence, Wordsworth far off and unregarded by the leaders of criticism. The poverty of poetry was not being redeemed by the learning or the brilliancy of prose writers. With the exception of Hallam, for Macaulay was only beginning his career, it would be difficult to name any historian whose work has lasted or deserved to last. Novelists were represented by Bulwer Lytton, who is still a superstition of the Germans, but to the two notices of whom by Carlyle few Englishmen will now greatly demur: 'a dandiacal philosopher;' and again, 'intrinsically a poor creature this Bulwer; has a bustling whisking agility and restlessness which may support him in a certain degree of significance with some, but which partakes much of the nature of *levity*. Nothing truly notable can come of him.' Indeed, very little truly notable has come of the literary world of England at the time that Carlyle came into it, a moody Titan with '*such eyes*.'

The unshrinking veracity with which he could speak of his friends, and his constancy to them in spite of great divergence in opinion, are, of course, most signally illustrated in the case of Edward Irving. For to a man like Carlyle, resolutely set against all external manifestations of religious feeling, and utterly contemptuous of nineteenth century Christianity, it must have been a sore trial to see his first and greatest friend dragged into the strangest excesses of sectarianism. And, so far as we can see, he never for a moment gave way to Irving, or allowed him to claim his sympathy in these things. He seems to have been throughout true to his own convictions; and the separation between the two would, with men of less nobility, have been complete. For, in addition to the difference in religious opinions, there was the private cause of difference alluded to in the *Reminiscences*, and now made clear to us by Mr. Froude. The circumstances of Carlyle's marriage we shall deal with later; of Irving's share in them we can speak very shortly. There can be no doubt that Irving and Miss Welsh loved each other, and that

she would have married him but for the obstacle of his previous engagement. Most loyally and uncomplainingly he seems to have kept to his promise; and she, full of respect and admiration, but without love, married Carlyle. It was not in human nature for her to remember without bitterness the part that Mrs. Irving had taken in preventing her marriage with Irving; and we cannot doubt that much of Carlyle's separation from his friend, and his apparently ignorant misrepresentation of Mrs. Irving's character, arose from his wife's recollection of what had passed between her and Irving, and of the way in which they were finally kept apart. But this alienation has left but few traces on his estimate of Irving's character. There are a few bitter passages, but they are invariably redeemed by beautiful words of just praise: and even when criticizing most severely what he could not but think to be Irving's delusions, he did so that 'at some future time of crisis and questioning dubiety in Irving's own mind he might remember the words of a well-affected soul, and they might then be a help to him.' Nearly every word he writes about Irving, down to the last notice, one of the most nobly mournful elegies a man ever had, is marked with sincerity and truth, and reminds us of Irving's own saying, 'in his last weeks of life: 'I should have kept Thomas Carlyle closer to me; his counsel, blame, or praise, was always faithful; and few have such eyes.' And we believe that, in the end, the judgment of the world will not be very different from Irving's. Carlyle was exaggerated and gloomy; he had a consciousness of superiority which was unpleasing and arrogant, though not unfounded; he was too much self-absorbed to be able to sympathize with men of different characters; but he was faithful in praise and blame, and he had eyes that have rarely been equalled in their power of insight.

It is this gift of clear sight that makes him so astonishingly accurate in description and tenacious in memory: that is, it was this that gave him the power to be accurate; but it was his moral strength, his steadfast adherence to truth, that made him exercise this power all through his life. His extraordinary descriptive genius seems to arise from his conscientious determination to see things and persons as they really are; and, having once pierced through the mists that conventionality and indolence and indifference usually cast round an object, the image was so clearly impressed upon his mind that no lapse of time seems to have obscured it. The scenes and the people that he had transiently looked upon sixty or seventy years before stand out by a few vigorous descriptive

wor
befo
not
mar
talk
Hill
'a s
danc
brea
agri
whit
feeb
and
in th
can
facts
This
may
lyle

a cre
up in
will g
dotes
much
how

To a
than
doub
Calv
were
mean
could
or, if
it far

I
thing
that
one
beco
grad
curac
once
the p
did f

words in the *Reminiscences*, as if they were then and there before him ; it is done in an incidental manner, as if he could not help it, but was obliged to set down the facts that his marvellous memory carried in it. For a few minutes he talked with the officer in charge of the survey on the Lomond Hills ; and fifty years later the poor man stands before us as 'a saucy-looking, cold official gentleman.' The 'faded Irish dandy,' to whom Carlyle and Irving, in the dim past, gave a breakfast at Annan, is portrayed as 'a parboiled insipid agricultural dandy,' with 'a superfine light green frock, snow-white corduroys ; age above fifty, face colourless, crow-footed, feebly conceited.' There are hundreds of equally vigorous and seemingly faithful pieces of 'instantaneous photography' in the *Reminiscences* and the *Life* ; and in reading them we can understand something of Carlyle's eagerness to get at facts, and his impatience of men who had no facts to tell him. This eagerness for fact was not common at that time, as we may see if we recall the contemporary literature ; and Carlyle corroborates this impression :—

'Not one of that class will tell you a straightforward story, or even a credible one, about any matter under the sun. All must be packed up into epigrammatic contrasts, startling exaggerations, claptraps that will get a plaudit from the galleries. I have heard a hundred anecdotes about William Hazlitt for example ; yet cannot by never so much cross-questioning even form to myself the smallest notion of how it really stood with him.'

To a man whose desire was to see and understand rather than to laugh and to feel, the talk of men like Lamb was, no doubt, as he says, 'inexpressibly wearisome ;' to the Scotch Calvinist, lightness and inaccuracy and mere 'idle tattle' were almost profanation, and, like his father, 'what had no meaning in it—above all, what seemed false—he absolutely could and would not hear, but abruptly turned aside from it, or, if that might not suit, with the besom of destruction swept it far away from him.'

It is to this resolution to see, to penetrate to the very thing itself, undarkened by tradition, or custom, or prejudice, that Carlyle owes much of his originality. The change from one literary epoch to another is brought about by men who become aware that the truths of former innovators have gradually thickened into falsehoods and conventional inaccuracies, and who determine to put them aside and to see once more the facts of life. What Wordsworth had done for the previous generation, Carlyle, in a very different manner, did for his ; he recalled it from conventional phraseology and

unreal modes of thought to reality and truth. 'Carlylese' has itself become a phraseology, and partakes of the nature of cant; but that should not blind us to the truth and veracity which formed the groundwork of his life, and which were due, in great measure, to his training as a Scottish peasant's son.

In the central passage of *Sartor Resartus*, indeed one might almost say of all his works, Carlyle declares that 'always there is a black spot in our sunshine: it is even the *Shadow of Ourselves*.' Few men have better exemplified the truth of this saying than its author; and the consciousness of his own self-absorption was, without doubt, one grand cause of his continued restlessness and melancholy. But it is very necessary to distinguish between self-absorption and selfishness. In act, Carlyle seems to have been a singularly unselfish man. As Mr. Froude points out, 'the savings of his thrift were spent in presents to his father and mother, and in helping to educate his brother.' It is not many men who would have endured a struggling life of hard work for several years in order to start a brother in his profession; yet much of Carlyle's early difficulty and hardship was caused by this. He seems never to have shrunk from giving, though he was never rich; and his giving was truly evangelical, in that it was done in secret. We have heard, on good authority, of instances of his thoughtful kindness in little troublesome cares for others, which are often harder than the giving of alms, and which he might have well been excused for disregarding. In the delightful *Journals* of his Quaker friend, Caroline Fox, we find an instance of his unprompted activity in helping the collier who had tried to sacrifice his own life to save another's. Many more cases could be recorded, but indeed Mr. Froude's *Life* is enough to clear him from the charge of having been in act a selfish man. His splendid devotion to his work, a work done without regard to himself, is itself a monument of unselfishness. It was not merely that he worked for very inadequate rewards, or that he refused to pander to popular taste in order to make money, but that the great bulk of his work is of an impersonal and general nature. For a man of such intense individuality and, as we now see, gnawing self-consciousness, it is wonderful how little of the 'shadow of self' there is in his writings. The great revelation of his own spiritual struggles once made in *Sartor Resartus*, he turned to apply for the benefit of the rest of mankind the strength and experience he had gained. Before these letters and journals were

publ
self
certa
port
a rev
instr
it m
the s
than
His
deni
was
othe
have
look
view
him
mak
inju
see
infin
to f
they
man
to K
feren
Carl
spec
trast
even
crea
of g
seil
add
prop
in h
coul
exco
sens
beca
abs
hyb
whi
prel

published, one caught indeed a glimpse of the 'shadow of self' in occasional phrases in the *Life of Sterling*, but they certainly do not mar the beauty of that finished and living portrait. Yet this was the man whose journal is as complete a revelation of continual self-absorption as any one of those instruments of morbid vivisection that we have ever seen. And it must also be owned that this was the man who manifested the same self-absorption in his utter unconsciousness, rather than disregard, of the feelings and wants of those around him. His character was a strange mixture of selfishness and self-denial: when he thought, he was unselfish; but his impulse was to be wrapped up in himself, and to be deaf and blind to other people. The fault comes out most plainly, as might have been expected, in his journal. It takes the form of looking at everything and everybody from his own point of view; he seems to have had a scornful incapacity for putting himself into the place of others. The result was not only to make him solitary and unhappy in his life, but it also seriously injured his intellectual power. A man begins to learn and to see deeply into the causes of things when he recognizes the infinite diversity of human faculties, and looks at other men to find out not merely, as Carlyle too often did, what use they can be to him, but what they are in themselves. If a man could not tell Carlyle any fact, if he could 'add nothing to him,' if he represented a different sphere of life with different interests and different thoughts, he was nothing to him; Carlyle simply rejected him as supererogatory. In his retrospect of life he seems to have dimly perceived this, and contrasts himself with his wife: 'She had a frank welcome to every sort of worth and even kindly singularity in her fellow-creatures, such as I could at no time rival.' A greater power of going out of himself and, by a 'sympathetic imagination, seeing as others saw, and feeling as they felt, would have added some truth to his historical books and much to his prophecies. But he could not welcome 'kindly singularities in his fellow-creatures,' unless they were like his own, and he could not, therefore, believe in improvement or in progress except on the exact lines which seemed good to himself.

When his own experience was in question, he lost all sense of proportion. His own discomforts and ailments became magnified beyond all measure, partly by his self-absorption, but partly also by his astonishing power of hyperbolic language. In the *Journals* of Caroline Fox, which give almost incidentally a far more vivid and comprehensible picture of Carlyle than we can get from Mr.

Froude's descriptions, will be found several admirable reports of his conversation, from which we can, to a great extent, understand its power and its extravagance. Many people, for instance, know the discomfort of railway travelling, but Carlyle was unable to compare himself with others, and his misery seems to stand out as a unique fact in the history of the world. 'In that accursed train, with its devilish howls and yells driving one distracted! . . . It is enough for me to reflect on my own misery.' It is the same with his dyspepsia; though in this, by the way, Mr. Froude seems to us to do him an injustice. He speaks of Carlyle's 'imagined ill-health,' and seems to think that if a man is 'impervious to cold' and has a strong constitution, he ought not to mind such a mere ailment as dyspepsia. But is it not just this that makes the peculiar torment of indigestion? A man does not die under it, he does not get better or worse, but it goes on through his whole life darkening everything, spoiling every pleasure, increasing every burden. This was its effect on Carlyle, and its influence on his writings and on his character can scarcely, perhaps, be overrated. But he speaks as if no one else had ever suffered from dyspepsia and sleeplessness; and he was totally unable to carry out his own reiterated precepts to bear in silence, not, as he says in *Sartor Resartus*, to 'pip and whimper and go cowering and trembling.' Still we must remember that this weakness and impatience were but external; they did not affect his work, and no one who knows what dyspepsia is will underrate the splendid perseverance which gave him strength to labour on through it all. For the chief misery of his ailment is that it is not merely pain, but pain which affects the intellect and the feelings alike; in his own vivid words: 'every window of your Feeling, even of your Intellect, as it were, begrimed and mud-bespattered, so that no pure ray can enter; a whole Drugshop in your inwards; the fordone soul drowning slowly in quagmires of Disgust.' He is a strong and a brave man who perseveres in laborious and unrepaying work through such a state; and we do not know who has a right to cast a stone at him if he did not endure in silence.

No doubt the most serious flaw in Carlyle's character was his disregard for the feelings of those around him, and especially his inability to see how hardly his mode of life was pressing upon his wife. We do not think Mr. Froude is justified in relying upon such a saying of hers as that which he quotes: 'Carlyle has exceeded all that my wildest hopes ever imagined of him—and I am miserable;' for we know

from
ex
dou
mis
life.
hus

wha
all v
wov

And
' wi
nam
ther
play
' H
mal
this
one
whi
quo
has
was
afte
not
in
him
gav
it:
so
faul
the
for
tha
will

tak
Mr.
Sco
wor
his
hav
to
tur

from other sources that she was quite as much given to exaggeration in language as he was ; and we have the less doubtful evidence of her letters to prove that 'I am miserable' by no means accurately represented her married life. It is not a 'miserable' wife who can write thus to her husband when absent :—

'To be separated from you one week is frightful as a foretaste of what it *might* be, but I will not think of this if I can help it ; and after all why should I think of life without you ? Is not my being interwoven with yours so close that it can have no separate existence ?'

And, in spite of Mr. Froude's strange statement, that 'with love his feeling for her had nothing in common but the name,' no one can read his letters to her without seeing in them the most genuine love, expressed in many beautiful and playful passages. It is simply a misrepresentation to say, 'He thought of a wife as a companion to himself who would make life easier and brighter to him. But this was all ;' for this is contradicted even by Mr. Froude's own comment on one of Carlyle's letters to his wife : 'The intense affection which he felt for her is visible in every line.' We will not quote from his letters to prove what is most clear to the hastiest reader ; 'every line' is enough to show that there was no lack of real love, on his side from the first, on her side after a very short experience of married life. The fault was not the absence of love, but his failure to express his love in their daily life, and the self-absorption which prevented him from knowing that she wanted something more than he gave her. As Caroline Fox, with a woman's sympathy, puts it : 'He does not pay that attention to little things on which so much of a woman's comfort depends.' It was a 'grievous fault, and grievously' did he 'answer it ;' for every page of the *Reminiscences* burns with the fire of unavailing regret for his lifelong selfishness ; but it was too late that he learnt that self-renunciation consists not only in submission to the will of God, but in self-denial and care for other people.

But there are on this subject certain facts which should be taken into account in judging Carlyle's conduct as a husband. Mr. Froude points out that his experience was that of a Scottish peasant, accustomed to see his mother and sisters work hard, and it was natural for him to expect the same of his wife. No doubt a man of Carlyle's understanding should have recognized the difference, and above all should have tried to soften the hardships of such a life to his delicately nurtured wife. But, when all is said, there is more excuse for

him than for the common run of men whose domestic selfishness is happily hidden under their natural obscurity; though we by no means wish, in urging excuses for Carlyle, to avail ourselves of perhaps the most absurd of Mr. Froude's many shallow generalizations about 'men of genius:' 'The mountain peaks of intellect are no homes for quiet people. Those who are cursed or blessed with lofty gifts and lofty purposes may be gods in their glory or their greatness, but are rarely tolerable as human companions.' Mr. Froude seems to know a good deal about 'men of genius,' but we cannot accept such a statement on his sole authority. Even if it were true, and many instances contradict it, it would be no excuse for Carlyle or any other ill-tempered 'man of genius.'

But there is another consideration which Mr. Froude refers to indeed, but only slightly. It is the fact that much of the fault was undoubtedly on Mrs. Carlyle's side. Here again we can bring in Miss Fox's testimony to supplement Mr. Froude's hints. He says: 'Miss Welsh too, as well as Carlyle, had a fiery temper. When provoked she was as hard as flint, with possibilities of dangerous sparks of fire.' 'The bitter arrow was occasionally shot back.' These and other similar remarks are corroborated by Miss Fox. Mrs. Carlyle is depicted by her as a woman of great conversational power, who was very apt to be exclusively sharp and even bitter in speech. Thus an exceptional visit to Mrs. Carlyle is called 'a humane little visit. I don't think she roasted a single soul, or even body.' In another passage she is described as 'giving some brilliant female portraiture, but all in caricature.' She is said to 'foster in him the spirit of contradiction and restlessness,' and again 'she plays all manner of tricks on her husband, telling wonderful stories of him in his presence, founded almost solely on her bright imagination.' This passage ends indeed with the statement 'They are a very happy pair;' but that such treatment must have had an irritating effect on him is clear, and the inference is borne out by many private anecdotes of the two. Our belief, founded on what we have heard, is that in some of his least agreeable qualities, especially in contemptuous criticism of others, she encouraged him; and that she was by no means the least to blame in many of the outbursts of passion that occurred between them.

We should not have said so much but that the subject has been already much discussed, and Mr. Froude devotes a considerable part of his two volumes to it. The private lives of

these two remarkable persons have become public property, and we are compelled to take notice of Carlyle's married life in estimating his character as a whole. Whatever may have been his faults, and though his wife may not have felt that her example was an encouragement to others to 'marry men of genius,' yet behind the roughness and reserve of her husband she was able to recognize the devoted love that he had for her, and to foretell, as we know for a fact, the 'apotheosis,' to use her own expression, that awaited her when no longer by his side.

The impression that this striking character leaves on our minds, as we read the various accounts of him, is that he was a man born out of time. He should have lived in a simpler, slower age. The complexity and hurry of modern life irritated and oppressed him; he made no attempt to explain these things, he did not use them in his theory of life, and when in practice he was confronted with them he raged at them with picturesque fury. His thoughts were always concerned with the simple broad facts of human life, with the moral rather than with the social phenomena of the age. When transplanted from the primitive solitudes of Ecclefechan and Craigenputtock to Edinburgh and London, he seems never to have his imagination stirred by the vastness and intricacy of the causes that have produced these great cities, or by the multitudinous facts of civilization; he has no thoughts for the manifold interests and conflicting motives that are working on the busy crowds of men; he is thinking of man in the simplest form, of the moral nature which is but little affected by the growth of nations, of the relations of individual men one to another, and to the 'Eternities and Immensities.' *Sartor Resartus* is an attempt to strip off not only the trappings of rank and station from individuals, but the accretions and deposits left by civilization on the original framework of society. Man is interesting to him in himself rather than in his conditions and surroundings. He reduces every problem to its simplest elements, seeing, for instance, in war only the bringing 'into actual juxtaposition' of able-bodied men from French and English villages of 'Dumdrudge,' and the mutual slaughter of 'these poor blockheads.' His peculiar humour consists largely in the unexpected simplification of the complex facts of life; his vision was so keen that, in piercing through all outer shells and coverings to the underlying realities, it often led him to disregard these coverings altogether, and to forget that they too are realities of a certain sort. Hence we can see why his life was very

much of the antique stamp. You hear very little of the 'gifts of civilization,' of railways and telegraphs and scientific discoveries, except as fuel for his wrath. His standard of religion and morality was the Puritan of some centuries back; he saw the last specimens of the race in Annandale, and 'all this is altered utterly at present.' All through his life his mind kept on recurring to the parents and friends of his youth in the simple village life, and contrasting them with the more subtle and intricate natures of cultivated London men and women, not at all to the advantage of these:—

'There is a kind of citizen which Britain used to have, very different from the millionaire Hebrews, Rothschild money-changers, Demosthenes Disraelis, and inspired young Goschens and their "unexampled prosperity." Weep, Britain, if the latter are among the honourable you now have.'

His contempt for political economy, the only science which has as yet been able to cope with the complexity of modern social life, was partly due to this instinct for simple forces and plain moral laws. Political economy revels in the complicated phenomena of civilization, and deals, or at that time used to deal, with them altogether apart from the moral law, scientifically and not ethically. But to Carlyle the only interest was the moral law, and the complicated phenomena of civilization were abominable in his eyes.

All this makes his teaching of less value than it would have been had he realized more fully the manifoldness of modern life. He had a clear eye for principles, but the intermediate stages between principles and action, the modifications and changes which civilization has wrought in the external expression of principles, were not clear to him, and he would put them aside with scornful impatience. This is now explained by the details of his life, which shows us the Ecclefechan Calvinist transplanted into the uncongenial crowd of London, and dwelling there all his days, a prophet of the desert carried into the city. His teaching, like his character, was more suited to the birth of a society than to its full life; his nature craved for simplicity and strength, and his destiny allotted to him a period of weakness and confusion.

There is always a certain relief in turning from the lives of great writers to their works. Their lives are troubled and stained by the circumstances in which they find themselves; they are full of whatever weakness their characters may possess. But their works are, almost always, the expression of their better natures; to them they escape from the sorry confusion and vexation of practical life, and from them they

are careful to keep as far as may be the weakness and faultiness of their own characters. So it is with Carlyle. His life was, as we have said, on the whole a noble life: but it had been better for the enjoyment of his writings had he remained to us what to most he used to be, an impersonal voice, warning and exhorting and teaching us as from a higher level than ours. But this is really an unworthy feeling. He was strong enough to hide his weakness and to keep it from marring his work, and we ought to be able to take what he gave us, the 'poor message' he had to deliver, without impairing its force by the thought that he did not altogether live up to the lessons he tried to teach. Even his writings, indeed, are not free from some of his characteristic faults; exaggeration, passion, and a perverse melancholy are visible in them as they were in his life; but they are wholly free from that weakness and littleness of character which have been made known to us by posthumous revelations.

Carlyle, it has been said, was a second-rate man with a marvellous gift of expression. This remark is, perhaps, a fair statement of what many have thought about Carlyle, and as such it is worth considering. A second-rate man is, we take it, a man without real inspiring originating force, with nothing new or specially valuable to tell the world. Add to such a man a wonderful power of speech or writing, and you have Carlyle.

Now, we do not believe that any really second-rate man can have an extraordinary gift of expression: or at least, if he is second-rate, the expression is also second-rate. Style, expression, power of language, whatever it may be called, is part of the intellectual endowment of the man; it represents the way in which the facts of life come to him, and from him are given out again to his audience. It is always possible to distinguish the mere rhetorician, who has nothing to say but a great power of saying it well, from the man whose soul is so penetrated with the truth he sees that his mode of utterance is transformed and moulded into harmony with it. Such a man is a poet; but Carlyle was not, in form, a poet. Rather with him the expression, the style, was formed not by the truths he proclaimed, but by his most characteristic intellectual endowment, his power of sight. His command over language is no mere capacity for putting other men's thoughts into eloquent words, but it is the direct result of his abnormal power of seeing clearly, and it enables him to make others see. Even if there were no original thoughts in Carlyle's writings, yet the force and descriptive power of his

style would of itself make him a great teacher, for such is a man who can teach others to see facts by the clearness with which he sees them and depicts them. Truths came to him in images, concrete visions, not abstract thoughts, and by no processes of reasoning but by his own imaginative strength he lays hold of them and fixes them for us on the enduring canvas of his pictorial style. Such a style is the effect, not the cause, of his greatness as a writer; it is the result of his unique insight, and the impossibility of really imitating it is the measure of the excellence of that special gift. The latest published of all Carlyle's writings is as good an example of his descriptive power as any of his more finished works; for morose and almost inhuman as the *Reminiscences of my Irish Journey* may be, there can be no question as to the power with which the dreary squalor of Ireland after the famine is made visible to the reader by the hasty words in which Carlyle recorded what he saw. The book is full of bits like this, as of a painter who with a few smudges gives you the true impression of a whole rainy landscape:—

“Outdoor relief” next; at a wretched little country shop; Shine's frank swift talk to the squalid crowd: dusty squalor, full of a noisy hum, expressing greed, suspicion, and *incarnated nonsense* of various kinds. Ragged wet hedges, weedy ditches; nasty ragged, spongy-looking flat country hereabouts; like a *drunk* country fallen down to sleep amid the mud.’

The careless vigour of the description wanted only the final image to make it an absolutely faithful picture of the impression many get, but few can put into words, from their Irish experiences.

The fault of the style is not its eccentricity and irregularity, which is the commonest accusation brought against it. The accusation is true, but it is not very important. It is not true, as is often assumed, that only classical works become classics; that books written in an eccentric style are not more than a nine days' wonder. Perfection of form is indeed a great preserver of what otherwise the world would very willingly have let die; *ce qu'il ne vaut pas la peine de dire, on le chante*, and the beauty of the music, the form, makes the commonplace matter immortal; but it does not follow that writings without regular form cannot live. Rabelais, Sterne, Richter, to mention only humourists who partly at least resemble Carlyle, show no signs of becoming obsolete; Shakspeare himself has been, and is still, accused, not without justice, of barbarous style and irregular construction; St. Augustine's *Confessions*, one of the only two classics which

hav
Ma
gra
is
fun
und
law
pop
sub
not
as t
that
of p

our
anc
he
acro
poet
of c
othe
of m
vent
men
prof
leav
preg
song
pass
ever
he f
thou
to ut
falls
noble

Do w
of ut
give
that
worl
confe

have come to us from the dark ages, is written, according to Macaulay, in 'the style of a field preacher;' and much of the grandest poetry of the Old Testament is, so far as manner is concerned, eccentric, rough, and obscure. Critics, whose function is to maintain the laws of form, are very apt to be unduly prejudiced against works of art which transgress those laws, and are often in consequence found in conflict with the popular judgment; and in the long run the critics have to submit and reconstruct their theories. Carlyle's writings will not have a shorter life because of their irregularity, bound up as that is with their peculiar excellences. The fault is rather that being in substance poetry they are not cast into the form of poetry.

Sir J. F. Stephen has called Carlyle the greatest poet of our age, and has singled out as his 'most memorable utterance,' the magnificent passage in *Sartor Resartus*, in which he describes the generations of mankind hasting 'stormfully across the astonished earth.' It is quite true, this is genuine poetry, grander, perhaps, than has been written by any poet of our age. But what one feels in reading this and many other passages is that the want of singing power, the absence of music, rhythm, metre, or whatever name it may have, prevents this grand poetry from sinking deep into the hearts of men. Thoughts, visions, images, are there in almost reckless profusion, but they miss their mark, and pass from the mind, leaving far less impression than many a less profound and pregnant utterance of poets who have possessed the gift of song. Carlyle himself seems to have felt this in the very passage referred to, for he ends by quoting, as no real singer ever does, another man's expression of the same truth, because he felt that that summed up and perpetuated for ever the thought that in a hundred transitory forms he was struggling to utter. His prose, almost unequalled in its vivid grandeur, falls back at the end upon the most solemn lines of the noblest passage in all poetry:—

'We are such stuff
As dreams are made of, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.'

Do we not feel, did not Carlyle feel, that this is the true mode of utterance for such thoughts as his, and that his inability to give them this poetical form robs him of much of the force that he would otherwise have had? When one thinks of the world-wide influence and familiarity that the gift of song has conferred upon the splendid commonplaces of such passages

as Byron's address to the ocean, it is easy to see what Carlyle has lost by his inability to express in worthy music the vast and majestic visions of his imagination. On almost every page of *Sartor Resartus* there are thoughts and images which only rhythm could fitly enshrine, and which without rhythm cannot, as they ought, dwell in the mind and bear fruit. The mere descriptions, or rather transfigurations, of natural scenes are of the highest poetical power :—

'A hundred and a hundred savage peaks, in the last light of Day ; all glowing, of gold and amethyst, like giant spirits of the wilderness ; there in their silence, in their solitude, even as on the night when Noah's Deluge first dried ! Beautiful, nay solemn, was the sudden aspect to our Wanderer. He gazed over those stupendous masses with wonder, almost with longing desire ; never till this hour had he known Nature, that she was One, that she was his Mother and divine. And as the ruddy glow was fading into clearness in the sky, and the Sun had now departed, a murmur of Eternity and Immensity, of Death and of Life, stole through his soul ; and he felt as if Death and Life were one, as if the Earth were not dead, as if the Spirit of the Earth had its throne in that splendour, and his own spirit were therewith holding communion.'

This is at least equal to most descriptive verse ; yet everybody knows Byron's storm in the Alps, and no one remembers the numberless pictures of imaginative beauty scattered throughout Carlyle's writings. We believe that Carlyle will always be read, but he will not be familiar and powerful as poets are, because he could not express his message in the most enduring form.

In sheer power over language and in capacity for producing great and varying effects of style Carlyle was, in our opinion, far superior to any English writer of his time. The sudden changes of tone, the rapid flashes of humour, the wide knowledge, the deep pathos, the earnestness, the scorn, and the ever-present sense of Infinity that distinguished his mind, are faithfully represented in his language. In his later works the eccentricity is too obvious and too forced ; he himself owned that there might be something of affectation in it. But the English language has had no grander uses than in *Sartor Resartus*, the *French Revolution*, and the earlier Essays. Such a passage as the well-known vision, as we might call it, of Marie-Antoinette's death, rising as it does suddenly upon one from the midst of the grotesqueness and irony of the *Diamond Necklace*, is more like a grand modulation in music than language ; it appeals directly and overpoweringly to the deepest emotions. This may well compare with Burke's famous passage :—

188
Bei
(lik
mon
of
Bir
to v
spl
guil
end
face
is o
one
atti
pale
drun
the
hea
shu
suff
her
not
who
and
of S
nigh
once
the
Wor
But
lang
sole
a le
'
I wi
dow
us h
simp
is a
Nat
brea
she
Cha
and
the
Arct
calle
how
from

'Beautiful Highborn that wert so foully hurled low! For, if thy Being came to thee out of old Hapsburg Dynasties, came it not also (like my own) out of Heaven? *Sunt lachrymæ rerum, et mentem mortalitæ tangunt.* Oh is there a man's heart that thinks, without pity, of those long months and years of slow wasting ignominy; of thy Birth, soft cradled in Imperial Schönbrunn, the winds of heaven not to visit thy face too roughly, thy foot to light on softness, thy eye on splendour; and then of thy Death, or hundred Deaths, to which the guillotine and Fouquier Tinville's judgment bar was but the merciful end! Look *there*, O man born of woman! The bloom of that fair face is wasted, the hair is grey with care, the brightness of those eyes is quenched, their lids hang drooping, the face is stony pale as of one living in death. Mean weeds, which her own hand has mended, attire the Queen of the World. The death hurdle, where thou sittest pale, motionless, which only curses environ, has to stop: a people, drunk with vengeance, will drink it again in full draught, looking at thee there. Far as the eye reaches, a multitudinous sea of maniac heads; the air deaf with their triumph-yell! The Living-dead must shudder with yet one other pang; her startled blood yet again suffuses with the hue of agony that pale face, which she hides with her hands. There is, then, *no* heart to say, God pity thee? O think not of these; think of HIM whom thou worshippingest, the Crucified—who also treading the winepress *alone* fronted sorrow still deeper; and triumphed over it, and made it holy; and built of it a "Sanctuary of Sorrow" for thee and all the wretched! Thy path of thorns is nigh ended. One long last look at the Tuileries, where thy step was once so light—where thy children shall not dwell. Thy head is on the block; the axe rushes—Dumb lies the World; that wild-yelling World, and all its madness, is behind thee.'

But even his letters show just as great a mastery in the use of language as his finished works, and we will set against the solemn pathos of the last quotation this lovely passage from a letter to Miss Welsh inviting her to Hoddam:—

'I will show you Kirkconnell churchyard, and Fair Helen's grave. I will take you to the top of Burnswark, and wander with you up and down the woods and lanes and moors. Earth, sea, and air are open to us here as well as anywhere. The water of Milk was flowing through its simple valley as early as the brook Siloa, and poor Repentance Hill is as old as Caucasus itself. There is a majesty and mystery in Nature, take her as you will. The essence of all poetry comes breathing to a mind that feels from every province of her empire. Is she not immovable, eternal, and immense in Annandale as she is in Chamouni? The chambers of the East are opened in every land, and the sun comes forth to sow the earth with orient pearl. Night, the ancient mother, follows him with her diadem of stars; and Arcturus and Orion call *me* into the Infinitudes of space as they called the Druid priest, or the shepherd of Chaldea. Bright creatures! how they gleam like spirits through the shadows of innumerable ages from their thrones in the boundless depths of heaven.'

The one quality which no critic can refuse to Carlyle is humour. Both in its highest and its deepest form it is present in almost everything he wrote. The mere accumulation of ludicrous images gives place to the almost fierce perception of the contrasts of life, and this again to that consciousness of the deep pathos in obscure and ignoble lives which underlies all true humour. One great element in it, as we have said, is the sudden simplification of the complex facts of life, such as the vision of the 'naked Duke of Windlestraw addressing a naked House of Lords;' or the totally unexpected retort upon the glorification of American institutions:

'What have they done? They have doubled their population every twenty years. They have begotten, with a rapidity beyond recorded example, Eighteen Millions of the greatest *bored* ever seen in this world before.'

But though this reduction of everything to its lowest terms is perhaps the most characteristic element in Carlyle's humour, its most useful function is to serve, so to speak, as a substitute for rhythmical power in enforcing and perpetuating the truths he wishes to teach. He cannot put into verse what he has to say, but he can clothe it in images so ludicrous and unexpected that they will haunt the mind almost as effectually as the smoothest poetry. Nothing could be more vivid and useful for its purpose than his description of a representative government which will not govern:

'If the thing called Government merely drift and tumble to and fro, no-whither, on the popular vortexes, *like some carcass of a drowned ass, constitutionally put "at the top of affairs."*'

It is difficult, in thinking of the problem of representative government, to get that malicious picture of the drowned ass out of one's mind; and that is just what Carlyle intended to do. The admirable stroke in *Sartor Resartus* of making Teufelsdröckh mistake 'Satan's Invisible World Displayed' for a History of the British Newspaper Press is of this class; it is so sudden and unexpected that it dwells in the mind longer than any gravely reasoned exposition of the evils of anonymous journalism.

But the deepest and finest element in Carlyle's humour was the power of sympathy it gave him with the weakest and most obscure fellow-creature. Humour comes close to goodness in its capacity for drawing out the good that there is in the worst and the meanest; and this was especially the gift of Carlyle, who, apart from his humour, was by nature disposed to dwell on the dark side both of events and of

persons. But as we are told in conversation he would end his fiercest tirades with a roar of laughter and a sympathetic word, so in his writings. He rages against the sins and the folly of his fellow-creatures, but he is keenly alive to their humble and unnoticed virtues, and can depict them with a sympathetic touch that recalls the earlier Carlyle of *Sartor Resartus*:

'With other eyes, too, could I now look upon my fellow man: with an infinite Love, an infinite Pity. Poor, wandering, wayward man! Art thou not tired, and beaten with stripes, even as I am? Ever, whether thou bear the royal mantle or the beggar's gabardine, art thou not so weary, so heavy-laden; and thy Bed of Rest is but a Grave. . . . Man with his so mad Wants, and so mean Endeavours, had become the dearer to me; and even for his sufferings and his sins, I now first named him Brother.'

We cannot stay to point out the way in which this power of sympathy enters into and colours all Carlyle's humour; let anyone who wishes to understand the difference between humour and wit, between sympathy and smartness, between true insight and superficial rhetoric, contrast Carlyle's with Macaulay's account of Boswell.

But, leaving the question of Carlyle's power of expression, is it just to say that, apart from this, he was but a 'second-rate' man, with no great truths to teach, no inspiration, no originality? It may be difficult for us to see the greatness and originality of his teaching, for his influence was so great that his writings have become commonplace, and the truths he proclaimed are now, so to speak, part of the atmosphere we breathe. It is the same with all really great teachers. Their writings are taken up into the life of the race, and when we come to read them we find that we have always known what they say. But we forget that we know it because they said it. Truth once discovered and proclaimed loses its originality; but falsehood can always be original. It is the really second-rate, clever man of whose writings we say, on first reading them, 'Here is something new: why has the world neglected this?' For a very good reason: it is found to be out of harmony with the facts of life; it was new and clever, and it is still new and clever, for the world has cast it aside and sought elsewhere for truth. We are living in the atmosphere which Carlyle created: to understand his greatness and originality we must put ourselves in the place of the men of his generation, and try to imagine the effect of his first writings on minds trained as those of his contemporaries were trained. To a generation whose representative

man of letters was Jeffrey, and which was beginning to worship Macaulay as 'the greatest man in England, not excepting Brougham,' Carlyle may well have seemed original. Perhaps we can easily conceive breaking away from Jeffrey and Brougham, and even from Bentham or Coleridge; but it is one thing to be independent of leaders whose influence no longer exists, and another to stand alone when everyone is flocking after this or that political or literary captain, and the air is thick with the shibboleths of various parties. It is Carlyle's peculiar characteristic that he belonged to none of these parties, and owned allegiance to none of these leaders. But the difficulty of this isolation may be estimated from the obvious impression which Jeffrey's position made upon him. The most independent and self-confident mind cannot help feeling a certain hesitating half-belief in the greatness of the leader of the hour. It is at least necessary to find reasons for not submitting to him; and even that may be to do him too much honour.

Carlyle was born at an unfavourable time for enthusiasm on either side in politics. He was too young to have felt the wave of excitement that carried the nation through the great war, he was too old to share the youthful hopefulness in the Reform Bill. The period of life at which a man's opinions and beliefs are formed, the years between twenty and thirty, coincided for him with those most dismal years of dulness and repression that succeeded the battle of Waterloo. Older men could buoy themselves up with the memories of great deeds in which they had borne some share, if only that of spectators: younger men, as they came into active life, could look onward to the anticipated triumphs of the New Era. It may sound fanciful, but we believe we are right in saying that, except Shelley and Carlyle, no one with any pretensions to be called great was born in England between the years 1790 and 1800. And Shelley is almost as good an instance as Carlyle of a man with a contemptuous disbelief in the British constitution, or in the prevailing creeds of party politicians. We may sum up Carlyle's influence in politics by saying that he taught Radicals to distrust Radicalism. He looked at the great Reform Bill with very dispassionate eyes, and proclaimed that 'it is the noble people that makes the noble government; rather than conversely.' The distrust in institutions as the means of regenerating society, the conviction, to use his own words, that 'no high attainment, not even any far-extending movement among men, was ever

accom-
grat
of I
teach
emph
age,
was
loped
fluen
but i
ordin
he c
miser

I
very
teach
Shoo
of th
of ol
in co
or ta
perv
fault-
eyes
or th
meas
far as

T
or ra
not y
be; a
medi
schoo
is wr
forty
blind
in the
along
with
calls
find h

H
has h
denur
men

accomplished mechanically,' but only 'dynamically,' the gradually increasing hesitation as to the unmixed advantages of Democracy, these are some of the results of Carlyle's teaching. They are commonplaces to us, but they were emphatically not commonplaces to the politicians of that age, to the Radicals, as well as to the Whigs and Tories. It was only by degrees that the 'gospel of force' was fully developed in his mind; he himself ascribes its growth to the influence on him of Cromwell's life and the events of 1848; but in 1832 his beliefs were scarcely less uncongenial to the ordinary Benthamite Radical: 'the opposite hemisphere,' as he calls it, 'was never wanting either, nor will be, as it miserably is in Mill and Co.'

It is strange to see how indifferent Carlisle became to the very measures which were the practical results of his own teaching. In what was almost his last political utterance, *Shooting Niagara: and After?* he sums up the achievements of the Reformed Parliament since 1832, as 'a general repeal of old regulations, fetters, and restrictions,' and declares that in consequence 'hardly any limb of the devil has a thrum or tatter of rope or leather left upon it.' This is but the perverseness of old age, determined to see only matter for fault-finding in all contemporary existence; for he turns his eyes away from such legislative acts as the New Poor Law, or the whole course of Factory Legislation, which were measures carrying out the principles of his teaching in so far as those principles were seen to be true.

There are many who believe that Carlyle's great political or rather economical reform, 'the organization of labour,' has not yet been carried out as far as it might, and indeed will be; and part of the great controversy that lies in the immediate future between the socialist and anti-socialist schools of Liberalism will centre round this question; but it is wrong to forget that much of the legislation of the last forty years has been occupied, roughly indeed, and somewhat blindly, in organizing labour. Carlyle was in reality a leader in the revolt against the *Laissez-faire* doctrine, and as such, along with a companion whom he would certainly have rejected with contempt, Comte, the 'phantasmal algebraic ghost,' as he calls him, he stands, where he would be greatly surprised to find himself, in the vanguard of modern Political Economy.

His best-known political doctrine was, however, one which has had only an indirect influence on modern politics. His denunciations of Democracy have, as we have said, inspired men with a certain distrust of the commonplace theory of

Radicalism, but they have not by any means been adopted as political maxims. Conservatives have never been quite comfortable in appealing to Carlyle's authority, and on this subject modern Liberalism seems resolved to disregard his warnings. Calvinism in theology is losing its influence, and Carlyle's political Calvinism, in which 'particular redemption' appears in a startling form, is not likely to hold its ground. It is no longer possible for anyone to believe that, theologically or politically, the greater part of the human race can be rightly described as 'sons of the devil in overwhelming majority'; and as no sane politician proposes that the people shall govern, but only that they shall be able to choose their own governors, many, not all, but many of Carlyle's violent attacks on modern Democracy lose their point.

The deepest exposition of Carlyle's political creed is contained in his *French Revolution*. In reading this splendid work, we must remember the overpowering effect which it had upon the minds of his contemporaries. We are apt now to forget that it is not only a work of art, a series of brilliant pictures of stirring events, but a great lesson full of meaning and warning to all thinking men. The lesson is to our ears trite and old; it may be summed up in the German saying, '*Die Welt-geschichte ist das Welt-gericht*,' the world is judged by its own history; but it was a new and a startling lesson to those for whom it was written. It was Carlyle's own philosophy of history, and he found it written out most clearly in the *French Revolution*. 'I should not have known,' he said, 'what to make of this world at all, if it had not been for the *French Revolution*.' Injustice, unbelief, dishonesty, lust, indolence, whatever may be included under the head of *lies*, must—this is the lesson of his history—sooner or later bring with them their own punishment. 'The first of all gospels is this, that a lie cannot endure for ever.'

But this lesson is enforced with a singular combination of prophetic fervour with philosophic reflection. At that time, at least, Carlyle could see both sides of a question. The evils of the old society were great, and they were doomed, but they should have been exterminated 'not with hatred, with headlong selfish violence, but in clearness of heart, with holy zeal, gently, almost with pity.' Carlyle could see clearly enough the truth that possessed the whole soul of Burke, and he expresses it in what is perhaps the most remarkable chapter in the book, viz., that which he entitled 'Questionable.'

'Great truly is the Actual; is the Thing that has rescued itself from bottomless deeps of theory and possibility, and stands there as

a definite indisputable Fact, whereby men do work and live, or once did so. Wisely shall men cleave to that while it will endure; and quit it with regret, when it gives way under them. Rash enthusiast of Change, beware! Hast thou well considered all that Habit does in this life of ours; how all Knowledge and all Practice hang wondrous over infinite abysses of the Unknown, Impracticable; and our whole being is an infinite abyss, *overarched* by Habit, as by a thin Earth-rind, laboriously built together?

One rises from Carlyle's *French Revolution* with a deep sense of two great truths: the pitiless retribution that awaits the societies as well as individuals that have become in their very essence false and make-believe; and also the incalculable nature of the forces which lie beneath modern society. Let them once escape from control, and no one can foresee the end.

'Without such Earth-rind of Habit, call it system of Habits, in a word, *fixed ways* of acting and believing—Society could not exist at all. . . . Let but, by ill chance, in such ever-enduring struggle, your "thin Earth-rind" be once *broken*! The fountains of the great deep boil forth; fire-fountains, enveloping, engulfing. Your "Earth-rind" is shattered, swallowed up; instead of a green flowery world, there is a waste wild weltering chaos, which has again, with tumult and struggle, to *make* itself into a world.'

Nevertheless, this is not history; it is not even a good narrative. It is not a sane, straightforward account even of the mere external facts with which it deals; it is, as Mr. Lowell expresses it in an admirable image, 'history seen by flashes of lightning.' Episodes and single scenes stand out with startling vividness, but there is much left untold and unexplained. And again, it is not history, in the more modern sense of an investigation and description of the causes of things. Carlyle has his broad and true generalization, that 'a lie cannot endure for ever,' and with that he is content. We have to go elsewhere for a detailed account of the actual causes of the French Revolution, for the more useful indications of the means by which society may avoid such cataclysms in the future. For these we must go to patient observers like De Tocqueville. Carlyle, true to his instinct for simplicity, cares nothing for the intricacies of the preceding conditions, and sees in the strange and complicated economical and social phenomena of the *Ancien Régime* only so many instances of the 'mad state of things' which was doomed to perish. His great moral generalization was true, but it is possibly less useful than the humbler analysis which laboriously traces out the intermediate causes, the less obvious instruments by which

the Divine purpose is carried out. But it is well to notice that, accustomed though we may be to the lesson he had to teach, it required all the force of a great genius to impress it on men's minds. It was not a mere generalization, it was not a mere statement of deductions made from unpublished records, it had nothing abstract or dead about it; it was like the presentation of a great drama, in which men could see the truth enacted in living reality before their eyes.

We approach a harder task when we come to estimate Carlyle's religious teaching. In a sense, and a very important sense, everything he wrote or did was religious; it was all closely connected with a very living conviction of the supremacy of God's will. So far, indeed, as he was able to translate religion into history and politics, and bring the omnipresence of religious truth home to men, his work had a most important religious influence. The extreme breadth and vagueness of his doctrine was favourable to this sort of teaching; and he had an unequalled power of making men feel how close to them are the 'Infinities and Eternities.' But, great as has been his religious influence on non-religious minds, we question whether the religious position of our age has been much influenced, for good or for ill, by Carlyle. To minds already filled with the general conviction in the reality of the soul, immortality, and God, he had not much to give; the mere translation of the well-known words into his peculiar phraseology rather weakened than strengthened their power on men to whom these facts were already the foundation of all knowledge and all speculation. We believe that his real influence in this respect was to give to 'secularists,' like J. S. Mill, a vague sense of something beyond what they could see: a doubt of the adequacy of reason and sense to penetrate all possible subjects. But positive religious belief he could not give; at most he could inspire emotions and 'vague misgivings' that might become the material with which religious belief could be constructed. But before that could be they must be condensed and compacted and moulded into shape.

Religion is the only sphere into which he admits democracy. The individual who, in the affairs of daily life, is, according to Carlyle, utterly incapable of governing himself, must 'get to see' religious truth for himself, or remain 'void of belief.'

'Of all these divine possessions it is only what thou art become equal to that thou canst take away with thee. Except thy own eyes have got to see it, except thy own soul have victoriously strug-

gled to clear vision and belief of it, what is the thing seen and the thing believed by another or by never so many others? Alas, it is not thine . . . but only a windy echo and tradition of it bedded in hypocrisy, ending sure enough in tragical futility, is thine.'

But however important a real faith may be, is it not a fallacy to assume that a man cannot take this faith from another? Cannot Carlyle's king, or wise man, to whose keeping the 'million blockheads' should entrust their lives, impress their souls also with a conviction of religious truth? It is a mere begging the question to say the one thing needful is faith; for is not every man's faith in great part always derived from others? Are we, in this alone, to be perpetually going back to the beginning, each man for himself, and disregarding what our predecessors have, with toilsome struggle, acquired for us? Sincerity of faith is of vital importance, but which is likely to be the most sincere, the faith that a dull and narrow man can find for himself out of the boundless confusion of the world, or the faith that he learns and takes on trust from the accumulated wisdom of his forefathers? It is a common fallacy, but nowhere is it more strange than in Carlyle, with his 'sons of the devil in overwhelming majority.'

This is closely allied with his various utterances about faith. Nothing can be truer or more necessary for this age to realize than the often-repeated assertion 'that, for man's well-being, faith is properly the one thing needful.' And one of the most valuable of the benefits conferred on us by Carlyle has been the enforcing of Goethe's saying: 'All epochs wherein belief prevails, under what form it may, are splendid, heart-elevating, fruitful for contemporaries and posterity.' Without faith, sincerity is almost impossible, and the other great lesson Carlyle has taught us is the necessity of sincerity. He has often been derided for his repeated diatribes against shams, impostures, cant, saying or believing the 'thing that is not;' but we believe that of all his lessons this has sunk deepest into men's hearts; and that it is less easy to be unreal, or to do work that is only for show, since he wrote, than it was before. This alone would be a sufficient achievement for a moralist or historian, to have made men conscious of unreality. And sincerity in religion is certainly not less important than in worldly affairs. But the matter is not as simple as it seems on reading Carlyle's vehement expositions of his creed. In the first place it is untrue to say, as Goethe implies, that the form of belief matters not so long as there is belief under some form. Is not this to fall into the strangely common fallacy of making religion merely

subjective? Religion, according to this view, is belief; surely it requires little thought to see that religion is, or should be, belief in what is true. And even granting that it is only a state of mind, surely it matters greatly what state of mind it is. A nation's civilization, its degree of goodness and wisdom, may, to a great extent, be calculated from the nature of its religious beliefs. One belief immolates thousands of victims to appease a fancied almighty despot, another induces men to live in the practice of nameless vices. Is it conceivable that, with these facts before us, we can wholly assent to the doctrine that 'all epochs wherein belief prevails, *under what form it may*, are splendid and heart-elevating'? But leaving this aside, for it is almost too obvious to linger over, does not Carlyle lay too much stress on the certainty of faith? 'A man's religion,' he says, 'consists not of the many things he is in doubt of and tries to believe, but of the few he is assured of and needs no effort for believing.' Here again, important though it assuredly is, this is but a partial truth. Faith is one of the noblest and most elevating gifts that come to men, but it is still human and therefore still imperfect. No man can think to have one part of his spiritual nature exempt from the law of infirmity; no human quality can be unstained with human corruption. Faith may increase and grow purer and more certain, but it cannot be the same as knowledge; it is impossible that there can be needed 'no effort for believing.' And Carlyle's doctrine is the very gospel of despair to those whose spirits at times flag and faint, and hope and faith die down in them, and no truth is held without an overshadowing doubt. 'No effort for believing!' Why, hardly a saint has died without the temptation to doubt; those who live most in the contemplation of the unseen are most alive to the numberless difficulties and dark-nesses of their creed, and not one would not gladly join in that most pathetic and truest of paradoxes, 'Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief.'

Carlyle ignores stages in faith, he will have all or none; and it is therefore easy to understand his contempt for those manifestations of religion with which he was most familiar. He believed in the faith of his parents, but he pours utter scorn upon a religion of 'Bishops, Gorham controversies, and richly endowed Churches and Church-practices,' for in such a religion he recognizes no real faith. It is a question whether he ever seriously looked for it; his impatience of Coleridge's teaching made him apparently disregard the 'spectral Puseyisms' and other religious results, as he thought them,

of
had
tics
so
the
him
oth
reli
was
whe
affo
whe
mar
Infi
selv
lear
enco
faith
taug
prac
his
espe
the
grea
taug
stan
his p
hum
belie
and
occu
to hi
religi
accou
ment
'mor
fixed
belie
decep
other
be sin
defin
lavish
victim
symp

of Coleridge's influence. Goethe with his wonderful insight had detected one at least of Carlyle's distinguishing characteristics: 'Carlyle was resting on an *original foundation*, and was so happily constituted that he could develop out of himself the requirements of what was good and beautiful—*out of himself*,' comments Mr. Froude: 'not out of contact with others.' In nothing is this characteristic so plain as in his religious belief; and though Goethe thought that in this he was 'happily constituted,' yet there is great reason to doubt whether any man has so comprehensive a mind that he can afford to disregard the religious experiences of others, even when their beliefs differ from his. God reveals Himself in many ways, and to understand even that small fragment of Infinity that is made known to us we must not confine ourselves to what each man's eyes can see for themselves, but learn what others are seeing, till, from the combined experience of very different minds, a truer and more comprehensive faith is gradually acquired. Carlyle in his works sometimes taught the necessity of sympathy and toleration: in his own practice he had little of either. He was not quick to change his opinions, nor ready to learn from others; and this is especially true of his religion. The *Life of Sterling* is one of the most perfect biographies in the language, but it has one great defect. Sterling had in all their intercourse apparently taught Carlyle nothing, because from the very first Carlyle stands outside him, and looks at him only as an instance of his preconceived ideas about life. He puts aside, with good-humour perhaps, but with some scorn, all Sterling's religious beliefs, in so far as they differed from his own, minimizes them, and treats them as unworthy of consideration. It never occurred to him that he might learn from this man, inferior to him though he undoubtedly was; that the fact of his religious position was a fact of which it would be well to take account, and not one to be dismissed as a 'diseased development' produced by the 'transcendental moonshine' of a 'morbidly radiating Coleridge.' The error is due to Carlyle's fixed determination to consider all contemporary religious belief, except his own, as conscious or unconscious self-deception. Cromwell, Luther, John Knox, Mahomet, and other pious men of the past, were sincere; but no one could be sincere who, in Carlyle's time, believed in anything more definite than Carlyle's 'Infinities and Immensities.' He lavishes pity and sympathy of a certain sort upon these poor victims, but there is no sign of an attempt at intellectual sympathy; he never thinks it possible that they can have

anything to teach him. Throughout the book Carlyle seems to look at Sterling rather as one looks at a bright and clever child, with love and good-nature combined with something of pity, almost of contempt. Yet this was the man of whom J. S. Mill wrote : ' If he did but know the moral and intellectual influence which he exercises without writing or publishing anything, he would think it quite worth living for ; ' and to whom he wrote ' that he would gladly exchange powers of usefulness with him.' That Carlyle, in his own religious self-concentration and spiritual pride, seriously misrepresented Sterling, we are led to think by Miss Fox's criticism, which, however, we grant may have been biased : ' It is painful enough to see the memorial of his friend made the text for utterances and innuendos from which one *knows* that he would now shrink even more than ever.' But the *Life of Sterling* bears in every page the marks of the unchristian and unwise temper which Carlyle himself describes as the result of his spiritual struggles and victory.

' This year I found that I had conquered all my scepticisms agonizing doubtings, fearful wrestlings with the foul and vile and soul-murdering mud-gods of my epoch ; had escaped as from a worse than Tartarus, with all its Phlegethons and Stygian quagmires, and was emerging free in spirit into the eternal blue of ether, where, blessed be heaven ! I have for the spiritual part ever since lived, looking down upon the welterings of my poor fellow-creatures, in such multitudes and millions still stuck in that fatal element, and have had no concern whatever in their Puseyisms, ritualisms, metaphysical controversies and cobwebberies, and no feeling of my own except honest silent pity for the serious or religious part of them, and occasional indignation, for the poor world's sake, at the frivolous secular and impious part.'

Such a temper is not one which could be favourable to progress in religion, and we may see in this absolute contempt for other men's beliefs some explanation of his isolation and unfruitfulness in spiritual matters.

But what was Carlyle's own belief ? Mr. Froude devotes several pages to the elucidation of this subject, and supports his exposition by a long paper in which Carlyle, unsatisfactorily to himself, had tried to state his own position. We cannot say that it is much more satisfactory to us. To begin with the negative part. He rejected historical Christianity because, as Mr. Froude puts it,

' he based his faith, not on a supposed revelation, or on fallible human authority. He had sought the evidence for it, where the foundations lie of all other forms of knowledge, in the experienced

facts
facts
But
do v
ence
whic
telli
earth
from
of l
exp
to r
Divi
thes
belie
well
eith
Carl
but
This
hast
' exp
pren
tion,
mira
diffe
even
but
forbi
that
out
old
rate
that
no su
of Ca
who
tical
out g
from
Resa
decla
Mr. I
entit
VO

facts of things interpreted by the intelligence of man. Experienced fact was to him revelation, and the only true revelation.'

But, the 'historical Christian' may here interpose, what else do we mean by revelation? By revelation we mean experienced facts, the facts of our Lord's life first and foremost, which cannot be interpreted fairly and rationally by the 'intelligence of man,' except as the revelation of God upon earth. Carlyle believed most firmly in our Lord, to judge from all his utterances on the subject, and invariably speaks of Him with a noble reverence. We find no attempt to explain away the facts of His life, but also we find no attempt to reconcile them with any other theory than that of His Divinity. How can the 'intelligence of man interpreting' these undoubted facts arrive at a consistent and scientific belief on the subject, without confronting the alternative, so well known to all who have tried to think out the subject—either this Man was God Incarnate, or His was not, what Carlyle calls it, 'the highest voice ever heard on this earth,' but the misleading utterance of an impostor or a madman? This alternative there is no sign that Carlyle, with his usual hasty contempt for reasoning, ever confronted; his appeal to 'experienced facts' and the 'intelligence of man' is therefore premature.

But Mr. Froude will say, by revelation he means 'revelation, technically so called, revelation confirmed by historical miracles,' and it is the miraculous element in the history that differentiates 'revelation' from other 'experienced facts.' Well, even then there remains that alternative to be confronted; but leaving that aside, we find that Carlyle 'felt himself forbidden to believe in miracles,' because 'he had learnt that effects succeeded causes uniformly and inexorably, without intermission or interruption.' This is, of course, a very old controversy, and it is one which it needs a more accurate reasoner than Carlyle to disentangle. The declaration that Mr. Froude quotes, 'It is as certain as mathematics that no such thing ever has been or can be,' is simply a declaration of Carlyle's unfitness to decide on such a question, as everyone who has thought about the distinction between 'mathematical' and 'physical' certainty must acknowledge. But, without going further into this interminable dispute, we may appeal from Carlyle 'late in his own life' to the Carlyle of *Sartor Resartus*, from Mr. Froude's interpretations to his own written declaration on the subject. We require no better answer to Mr. Froude's exposition than the chapter in *Sartor Resartus* entitled 'Natural Supernaturalism.'

"But is not a real Miracle simply a violation of the Laws of Nature?" ask several. Whom I answer by this new question, What are the Laws of Nature? To me perhaps the rising of one from the dead were no violation of these Laws, but a confirmation; were some far deeper Law, now first penetrated into, and by Spiritual Force, even as the rest have all been, brought to bear on us with its Material Force.

'Here, too, some may inquire, not without astonishment, On what ground shall one, that can make iron swim, come and declare that therefore he can teach religion? To us, truly, of the nineteenth century, such declaration were inapt enough, which nevertheless to our fathers, of the first century, was full of meaning.

"But is it not the deepest Law of Nature that she be constant?" cries an illuminated class. "Is not the Machine of the Universe fixed to move by unalterable rules?" Probable enough, good friends; nay I, too, must believe that the God, whom ancient inspired men assert to be 'without variableness or shadow of turning,' does indeed never change; that Nature, that the Universe, which no one whom it so pleases can be prevented from calling a Machine, does move by the most unalterable rules. And now of you, too, I make the old inquiry, What those same unalterable rules, forming the complete statute-book of Nature, may possibly be?

'They stand written in our Works of Science, say you; in the accumulated records of man's experience? Was man with his experience present at the Creation, then, to see how it all went on? Have any deepest scientific individuals yet dived down to the foundations of the Universe, and gauged everything there? Did the Maker take them into His counsel, that they read His ground-plan of the incomprehensible All; and can say, This stands marked therein, and no more than this? Alas, not in anywise! These scientific individuals have been nowhere but where we also are; have seen some handbreadths deeper than we see into the Deep that is infinite, without bottom as without shore. . . .

'System of Nature! To the wisest man, wide as is his vision, Nature remains of quite *infinite* depth, of quite infinite expansion; and all experience thereof limits itself to some few computed centuries and measured square miles. The course of Nature's phases, on this our little fraction of a Planet, is partially known to us: but who knows what deeper courses these depend on; what infinitely larger Cycle (of causes) our little Epicycle revolves on? To the Minnow every cranny and pebble, and quality and accident, of its little native Creek may have become familiar; but does the Minnow understand the Ocean Tides and periodic Currents, the Trade-winds, and Monsoons, and Moon's Eclipses; by all which the condition of its little Creek is regulated, and may, from time to time, (*unmiraculously enough*) be quite overset and reversed? Such a minnow is Man: his Creek this Planet Earth; his Ocean the immeasurable All; his Monsoons and Periodic Currents the mysterious Course of Providence through *Æons of Æons*.'

The positive side of Carlyle's religion when we come to it does not seem, at first, to give the hungry soul so much spiritual nourishment as his enthusiastic descriptions of it would lead one to expect. It is difficult to state it formally without discovering its nakedness. It is certainly not Christianity; sometimes it is hardly religion at all. It was never more than a Calvinistic Theism, and it seems to have become more and more vague, and more unlike Christianity as his life advanced. Though there may be strength, there is no comfort, in such a religion as is described in the paper published by Mr. Froude, and in the biographer's own summary of Carlyle's faith. It seems to be little more than a belief that God's Will governs the world, that the expression of that Will in the world of fact and in the laws of nature is what we call right, to go counter to God's Will is wrong, and finally that of God Himself we can know nothing certain but that He is and is just and almighty, and remains the same though all theories about Him change and pass away. Carlyle apparently thought this last truth of great importance; in this alone we shall find peace; this is 'the crowning discovery, the essence and summary of all the sad struggles and wrestlings of these last three centuries.' It is difficult to feel much confidence in this discovery. We know, and have always known, that whatever our theories may be God is not affected by them, but remains the same, and the 'spiritual universe' is not abolished because men have come to think differently about it. But our relation to God and to the spiritual universe is affected by our theories, and that is the important thing for us. How and in what way does the thought of God enter into our lives? This is nearly, if not quite, as vital a question as, how does God's Will affect our lives? Because, as far as we can see, our relation to God's will, our obedience to it or disregard of it, must to a great extent depend upon what we know or think of it. It is a poor consolation to tell us 'that it is we and our dog-hutch that are moving all this while,' if the result of such movement is that we know not what God's Will is. Religion is the relation of man to God; change either of the correlatives and the relation must change, and what security have we, on Carlyle's own principles, that such changes will not go on for ever; in other words that we shall never attain to religious Truth, or therefore to right religious practice?

This paper is, fortunately, not the 'only declaration of Carlyle's religious belief that we possess; for his religion, such as it was, is written, as we have said, on almost every page of

his books. We can trace, even in this paper, the indication of the essential part of it, the truth which he did not discover, but which he preached with almost unique force, the duty of self-renunciation. But in this paper it is only an intellectual submission that is taught; we must learn to know that we are not the central point of the universe. Turn, however, to those few pages which contain the consummation and fruit of his teaching, the central chapters of *Sartor Resartus*, and we shall there learn that self-submission is primarily ethical, and that the 'Everlasting Yea' is no intellectual solution of a problem of the reason, but a command addressed to the will and the heart, 'Love not Pleasure; love God.' The essence of his religion is therefore duty, the moral law; the path by which he made his escape from a vague Pantheism into a real relation to a personal God was the recognition of the moral nature of the Eternal Being whom he otherwise so blindly worshipped. With this clue we can follow him through the labyrinths of his religious visions; we can understand how the 'eternities, and infinities, and immensities,' which he has been so derided for perpetually preaching, are to him great realities with a definite meaning. So far as we can understand from his own account, the moment of what he calls his 'new birth' came when he realized his own freedom: 'The Everlasting No had said: "Behold, thou art fatherless, outcast, and the Universe is mine (the Devil's);" to which my whole Me now made answer: "I am not thine, but Free, and for ever hate thee!"' From this consciousness of freedom the first step is to pass to the consciousness of duty, of the battle that has to be fought with our own selfishness:

'For the God-given mandate, "Work thou in Well-doing," lies mysteriously written, in Promethean prophetic characters, in our hearts; and leaves us no rest, night or day, till it be deciphered and obeyed; till it burn forth, in our conduct, a visible, acted gospel of freedom. And as the clay-given mandate, "Eat thou and be filled," at the same time persuasively proclaims itself through every nerve—must not there be a confusion, a contest, before the better Influence can become the upper?'

From this 'preliminary moral Act, Annihilation of Self,' it is not difficult to pass to the consciousness of God, revealed in nature, but hidden till man recognizes that the world is not meant to satisfy our appetites, and could not do so had we each 'God's infinite universe altogether to himself.' Nature, then, does not give us happiness, but when this is once recognized, nature does give us God:

'*Es leuchtet mir ein*, I see a glimpse of it! there is in man a HIGHER than love of happiness: he can do without happiness, and instead thereof find Blessedness! Was it not to preach-forth this same HIGHER that sages and martyrs, the Poet and the Priest, in all times, have spoken and suffered; bearing testimony, through life and through death, of the Godlike that is in man, and how in the Godlike only has he Strength and Freedom? Which God-inspired doctrine art thou also honoured to be taught; O heavens! and broken with manifold merciful afflictions, even till thou become contrite, and learn it! O thank thy destiny for these; thankfully bear what yet remain; thou hadst need of them; the Self in thee needed to be annihilated. By benignant fever-paroxysms is Life rooting out the Deep-seated chronic Disease, and triumphs over Death. On the roaring billows of Time thou art not engulfed, but borne aloft into the Azure of Eternity. Love not Pleasure; love God. This is the EVERLASTING YEA wherein all contradiction is solved: wherein whoso walks and works it is well with him.'

We are reminded of a striking and instructive passage in one of his letters: 'You have a right to anticipate excitement and enjoyment. The highest blessing I anticipate is peace.'

From this conviction we are led on to the knowledge that freedom, self-renunciation, the love of God, lead up to, and are themselves made possible by, dutiful action. Thus the course of practical religion is, as he calls it, 'a visible, acted Gospel of Freedom.' Starting from the sudden revelation of a free personality, he ends with the solemn words he was never tired of repeating, 'Work while it is called To-day; for the Night cometh, wherein no man can work.'

It is easy to say, all this is nothing new; it is, at least, as old as Christianity; and even in details it is taken without much variation from Kant's Ethics. But moral truth is no new thing, nor can we expect it to be new; what is new is the force with which it is preached. This is the true answer to the assertion that Carlyle was but a second-rate man with a marvellous power of expression. No second-rate man could have written those chapters of *Sartor Resartus*; no second-rate man could thus have translated his own spiritual experience into language of strength and inspiration for all. The second-rate man's experience remains particular and unfruitful, partly because he never clearly distinguishes and feels it for himself, partly because he cannot impart it, universalize it. In Carlyle we recognize one of the world's teachers, for what he knew to be truths he could proclaim with a voice that men could not but listen to. The greatness of a teacher does not lie in the novelty of the truths which he knows, but in the force by which he constrains men to

listen to him, and still more to believe him. Mr. Bagehot has said that the liking for Carlyle is a youthful taste, which wears off with years and experience. He did not recognize that to inspire the young is at least as great and valuable an achievement as to instruct the old. Carlyle's merit as a moralist consists in the contagious force of his own moral nature.

We are conscious of having omitted much in this survey of the great writer's influence. For evil as well as for good he has so deeply affected our generation that it is difficult to refrain from pointing out traces of his handiwork in widely different directions. Not only in the noisy adherents of the 'gospel of force,' but in such curiously dissimilar writers as J. S. Mill, Mr. Ruskin, Dickens, and Mr. Matthew Arnold, we find in greater or less degree the unmistakeable marks of Carlyle's power. Without going beyond the four writers we have named, it is easy to see how, through them, the effects of Carlyle's character and doctrines must have been extended and perpetuated. Had he done nothing more than profoundly to modify Mill's rigid economical and political theories, he would still be a most real and living force in the social life of our generation.

But he has done much more. Politically, Carlyle's is not a constructive force. His influence is indirect; he checks and modifies and makes men pause. He is the only really great Conservative writer of our time, though he would justly reject the name, and Conservatives may shrink from accepting his help. Even in politics he was far more than Conservative, but it is his Conservatism that has chiefly survived. To understand the truth of Goethe's saying, 'Carlyle is a moral force of great importance,' we must turn from his politics to his ethics and to his religion. We must give ourselves up to the influence of his abiding sense of the presence of God about us and within us; we must stand with him 'at the conflux of two Eternities,' and see with his eyes the 'Godlike rendered visible: Eternity looking through Time.' For it is by these feelings of the infinity and eternity of man's life and destiny that Carlyle is an ennobling and elevating influence; from these feelings he derives the force of his exhortations to labour, of his denunciations of what is false and dishonest. The strong grasp of reality, the permanent impulse which he has given to sincerity and truth, the sense of the excellence of law and order, as expressing God's Will, these things make up the chief part of Carlyle's greatness, and these things are due to his feeling of the encompassing mystery of eternity.

There is a dark side to his teaching. His love of order tended to become materialism; law with him degenerated into force; sincerity was not always distinguished from brutality: but the wisdom of learners is to take, as far as we may, what is good, and to put away and forget what is evil, in the teaching of those few men to whom are given insight and force to guide their fellow-creatures. We will think of Carlyle as he himself has taught us to think of great men in spite of their weaknesses and failures—as

'one of those to whom, under ruder or purer form, the Divine Idea of the Universe is pleased to manifest itself; and, across all the hulls of Ignorance and earthly Degradation, shine through, in unspeakable Awfulness, unspeakable Beauty, on their souls; who therefore are rightly accounted Prophets.'

ART. IV.—THE REVISED VERSION AND ITS CRITICS.

I. REVISERS :—

Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Chairman; speeches in Convocation, May 17, 1881 (*Chronicle of Convocation*, pp. 200-209); Pastoral, January 1882 (*Guardian*, p. 132); share in pamphlet on 'The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament, by Two Members of the New Testament Company' (Macmillan, 1882). *Bishop of Durham*, replies to Canon Cook (*Guardian*, September 7, 14, 21, 1881), and short address at Church Congress, Newcastle. *Archbishop of Dublin*, Charge, 1881, pp. 16-28 (Dublin: Hodges and Co.). *Bishop of Salisbury*, Charge, 1882, pp. 15-22 (Rivingtons). *Bishop of St. Andrews*, Charge, 1881 (*Scottish Guardian*, September 30). *Dean of Lichfield*, Sonnets written in the course of the Revision, 1870-1880 (Rivingtons). *Dean (late) of Westminster*, article in *Times*, July 20, 1881. *Dean of Llandaff*, Sermons, 'Authorized or Revised?' 1882 (Macmillan). *Archdeacon of Oxford*, Preface to Oxford text of Greek New Testament; paper at the Newcastle Congress, 1881; share in pamphlet mentioned above, by two members of the Company. *Canon Kennedy*, Ely Lectures on the Revised Version (Bentley). *Dr. Scrivener*, Preface to Cambridge text of Greek New Testament. *Mr. Humphry*, 'A Word on the Revised Version of the New Testament' (S.P.C.K.), and 'A Commentary on the Revised Version' (Cassell and Co.). *Dr. Roberts*, 'Companion to the Revised Version of New Testament' (Cassell and Co.). *Dr. Newth*, Lectures on Bible Revision (Hodder and Stoughton). *Dr. G. Vance Smith*, article in *Nineteenth Century*, June 1881; and pamphlet on Revised Texts and Margins.

II. ASSAILANTS :—

Quarterly Review, Nos. 304, 305, and 306.¹ *Dublin Review*, July 1881, and afterwards on 1 John v. 7, &c. *Sir E. Beckett*, 'Should the Revised New Testament be Authorised?' and reply to Canon Farrar (Murray, 1881-2). *Canon Cook*, Two Letters to the Bishop of London on 'Deliver us from Evil,' and on the Revised Version of the First Three Gospels (Murray, 1881-2). *Dr. S. C. Malan*, Seven Chapters of the Revision of 1881 revised; and Select Readings, &c., revised (Hatchards, 1881-2). *G. W. Moon*, 'The Revisers' English' (Hatchards). *G. W. Samson*, 'The Text used for the Revised New Testament shown to be Unauthorised' (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Moses King).

III. DEFENDERS OTHER THAN REVISERS :—

Dr. Sanday (of Greek text only), *Contemporary Review*, December 1881. *Canon Farrar*, *Contemporary Review*, March 1882. Articles in the *Church Quarterly Review*, and elsewhere.

IV. DOCTRINAL CRITICISM :—

Bishop of Llandaff, on Galatians ii. 16, *Guardian*, August 31, 1881. *Bishop of Melbourne*, address printed in *Guardian*, March 29, 1882 (p. 461). *M. F. Sadler*, *Guardian*, August 24, 1881 (p. 1193). *S. Cox*, in *Expositor*, vol. iii. p. 434, &c. *T. Chamberlain*, 'The Revised Version; its bearing on Catholic Doctrine' (Masters and Co., 1881).

V. GENERAL CRITICISM :—

Bishop of Lincoln, address at Lincoln Diocesan Conference, October 21, 1881. *Bishop of Derry*, Charge, 1881; reprinted from *Londonderry Sentinel*. *Bishop of Carlisle*, Pastoral Letter, Christmas 1881, p. 24. *Bishop Oxenden*, 'Plain Words on the Revised Version' (S.P.C.K.). *Dean of Peterborough*, *Contemporary Review*, July 1881. *Dean of Wells*, paper at Church Congress, Newcastle. *Chancellor Espin*, address printed in *Guardian*, November 23, 1881. *Dr. Field*, 'Otium Norvicense,' Pars 3^{ia} (privately printed). *Professor Evans*, address at Church Congress, Newcastle, and papers in the *Expositor*, vol. iii. *E. B. Nicholson*, 'Our New New Testament' (Rivingtons). *F. Tilney Bassett*, a Sermon on the Revised Version (Church of England Pulpit Office, 1881). *C. F. B. Wood*, 'Notes to illustrate the New Testament by LXX and the Hebrew Scriptures' (Rivingtons, 1882). *W. A. Osborne*, 'The Revised Version of the New Testament' (Kegan Paul and Co.). *A. Dewes*, Preface to 'Life and Letters of S. Paul' (Longmans). *M. F. Sadler*, Notes on S. Matthew (Bell and Sons).

THE length of the above enumeration will justify us, we trust, in thinking that the time has come to attempt a general summary of what has been urged for and against the Revised Version during the eighteen months since it was published, before

¹ These three articles are advertised for republication under the title, 'The Revision Revised;' with a preface, and with the name of the author, Dean Burgon, of Chichester (London: John Murray).

all int
writen
course
which
shoul
the at
been
the G
repres
confir
Engli
upon
And
shake
been
gratit
plyin
Word
T
is stil
to dr
that
mann
ceive
the c
are s
T
are t
was
excit
milli
whic
ever,
not
the c
I
the l
Revi
the p
was
whic
spee
the
that
they

all interest in the controversy has passed away. The mere list of writers shows the range which it has covered; and this is, of course, independent of the multitude of anonymous criticisms which have appeared in various periodicals and journals. We should be safe in asserting that there never was a time when the attention of so great a variety of well-qualified critics has been concentrated on the problem of the relation between the Greek text and the English version, and the best way of representing the one by the other. We now propose to confine ourselves as closely as we can to criticisms upon the English revision, entering no further than is unavoidable upon the subject of the new Greek text which lies behind it. And we must be explicit at the outset in declaring our unshaken conviction that, after all reasonable deductions have been made, the Revisers have earned the deep respect and gratitude of all who can appreciate the importance of supplying the English reader with an exact interpretation of the Word of God.

The fact that the Revised Version of the Old Testament is still unfinished supplies an additional reason for attempting to draw up such a summary at the present time. It is possible that some lessons may be suggested by the history of the manner in which the Revised New Testament has been received, which it may be desirable to submit respectfully to the consideration of the Old Testament Revisers while they are still engaged upon their anxious labour.

The chief points which attract attention on the retrospect are these:—The complacency with which the Revised Version was ushered into the world; the wide public interest which it excited, as attested by the immediate sale of about two million copies; the acquiescence and even welcome with which it seemed to be accepted; the admonitory signs, however, which might have shown that this happy fortune was not likely to continue; the completeness, and we must say the overstrained hostility, of the recoil.

It is curious to turn back from the heated atmosphere of the later controversy to the calm complacency with which the Revised Version was laid before Convocation, and issued to the public. Not the slightest shadow from the coming storm was allowed to spoil the satisfaction of the proud humility which is expressed in the Revisers' Preface, and in the speeches with which the Chairman of the Company introduced the book to Convocation. He assured that venerable body that, in spite of the numerous alterations which he admitted they had made (but the number of which he underestimated

by at least one-half),¹ 'the effect to the general hearer or reader will really hardly be perceptible;' and he thinks this result so remarkable (as indeed it would be, if true), that he gives several reasons to account for it, which read oddly by the side of subsequent comments.² To the same effect wrote his brother reviser, Dean Stanley, in the latest contribution which he made to literature: 'the general flow of the Sacred Narrative escapes any changes which, *except by microscopic survey*, could affect a cursory perusal.'³ It would seem as if the reiterated readings aloud, on the value of which so much stress has been laid, had slightly dulled the Revisers' sense of hearing, so that they became unconscious of the extent of the changes they had made, or, as their adversaries would say, of the mischief they had wrought.⁴

A good illustration of the state of public feeling may be found in a sermon preached at S. Paul's by the Bishop of Truro, only three days after the book was published:—

'This week is eloquent in the ears of all English-speaking men. The New Version of the New Testament has been but three days in possession of their silence. . . a New Version, richer (we trust) with all that three centuries have added; clearer with all that three centuries have illustrated of knowledge, of criticism, of insight. . . Time speaks in that New Testament with a new and eloquent voice.'⁵

A little later, when some adverse mutterings had been heard, the Archbishop of Dublin, himself a Reviser, said in his Charge (p. 18), that it is 'very remarkable how slight this cry of dissatisfaction was, how few the offended, and how moderate the amount of the offence by them taken.' When Mr. Humphry, another of the Revisers, addressed a 'Burlington Conference' of clergy and laity in the following July, he thought that they had to deal with no opponents but 'a few honest irreconcilables,' whom he likens to the bigoted Cambridge men who decreed 'that the New Testament of Erasmus should not be brought within the college precincts, on shipboard or horseback, by wagons or porters.'⁶ He went on to express the hope that 'even they' would 'in time relax their frowns.' One of his hearers, it seems, was Sir Edmund Beckett, the

¹ 'Perhaps reckoning on some different principles,' says Sir E. Beckett, very fairly, p. 39.

² *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1881, p. 208.

³ 'The Revised Version of the New Testament,' in the *Times* for July 20, 1881.

⁴ Compare the Bishop of Salisbury's Charge, pp. 19, 20.

⁵ *The Voice and its Homes*, pp. 1, 2.

⁶ *Brewer's English Studies*, p. 358.

very
not b
but
autho
duce
mend
for a
that,
intro
B
It mi
Versi
even
this
suffici
The
aliena
warni
single
transl
outwa
formu
again
Septu
illustr
lost be
for the
bisho
term
the p
for the
inspire
Standi
the Au
great
have
labour

¹ Se
13, 15,
1856, an
Bishop
tolerabl
As a sp
on John
would t
intruder

very chieftain of the scorers, by whom that expectation has not been fulfilled. Canon Cook, who is another distinguished but 'irreconcilable' opponent, says that the weight of the authority by which the Revised Version was supported 'produced so strong an effect,' that up to the date of the 'tremendous onslaught' in the *Quarterly*, 'the question appeared for a time to be generally regarded as at last settled; and that, notwithstanding the serious and most painful innovations introduced into the sacred text' (p. 11).

But, in truth, the change was due to a variety of causes. It might have been foretold with certainty that any Revised Version whatever would be sure to rouse a strong opposition, even if for the moment the outburst was delayed. Indeed this result was clearly foreseen, though perhaps not quite sufficiently provided against, by the Revisers themselves. The old terrors revived, as we were threatened with the alienation of churches and the weakening of faith.¹ The warning might have been emphasized by the history of every single attempt on record to improve either the text or the translations of Holy Scripture, or in fact to tamper with the outward expression of any other venerated and established formula. Such was the antagonism roused in old times against the paraphrase of the Targum, the translation of the Septuagint, the revision of the Vulgate. Such was the feeling illustrated by the old familiar tales of the bishop who nearly lost both his flock and his see by substituting Jerome's *hedera* for the old *cucurbita*, in the history of Jonah's gourd; of the bishop who reproved a learned colleague for using the polite term *σκληροὺς*, instead of the provincial *κράββατος*; and of the priest who refused to change his familiar *mumpsimus* for the newfangled *sumpsimus*. Such was the temper that inspired the 'irreconcilables' who denounced, like Lee and Standish, the Greek text of Erasmus; or, like Hugh Broughton, the Authorized Version of 1611; or, like Daniel Whitby, the great collection of various readings made by Mill; or who have been disturbed from time to time by the critical labours of Stephanus, of Walton, of Wetstein, of Bengel, of

¹ See Lightfoot, on a *Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, 1871, pp. 4, 13, 15, 19. Compare Malan's *Vindication of the Authorized Version*, 1856, and other works; Burgon on *S. Mark*, 1871, p. 264; and *Letter to Bishop Ellicott: An Unitarian Reviser of our Authorized Version in tolerable*, 1872; McClellan, *Preface to New Testament*, 1875, p. xiv. &c. As a specimen of popular protests, take the late Dr. Punshon's *Lecture on John Bunyan*, 1857, pp. 30-33. He says, 'to the mistaken men who would tamper with' (the Authorized Version), 'hands off there, proud intruders! Let that Bible alone!'

Lachmann. 'The generation,' said Tregelles, in 1854, 'of Edward Lee and Daniel Whitby is yet flourishing amongst us;' and it shows no signs of decay now that we are dealing with a fresh race of critics. These considerations might have prepared us to look forward with certainty to a recoil.

Much weight must also be assigned to the rumours of the misgivings which were said to be felt by some of the Revisers themselves; to the criticisms of such highly qualified observers as the Bishops of Lincoln and Derry, Dr. Field, and Canon Cook; to the fierce assaults of hostile advocates like Sir Edmund Beckett; and certainly in no small degree to the three famous articles in the *Quarterly*, which stand unrivalled in the present age as examples of continuous and powerful invective, supported by an unusual array of learning, and driven home by a clear tenacious purpose.

But, independently of these attacks, and before most of them had been delivered, a serious blow had fallen from a different and apparently a not unfriendly quarter. The book has not yet recovered from the shock of the discovery which was published by a correspondent of the *Guardian*,² that the Revisers had made 36,191 changes in the English text, or an average of *four and a half* changes in every one of the 7,960 verses; more than double the number with which the Chairman had somewhat startled many of his hearers. The Bishop of Lincoln accepted this calculation, and gave a sting to it by asking whether the Church 'could consistently accept a version in which 36,000 changes have been made, *not a fiftieth* of which can be shown to be needed or even desirable.'³ The concentration of change in some specially unfortunate passages was shown by the *Quarterly* Reviewer, who found that in the one place, 2 Peter i. 5-7, the Revisers had 'introduced 30 changes into 38 words.'⁴ How widely, on the other hand, these alterations are distributed was proved by a correspondent of the *Expositor*, who has calculated that not 800 verses out of nearly 8,000—*i.e.* scarcely one verse out of every ten—has escaped correction. The magnitude of the changes is implied in what he further states: that 16 entire verses dis-

¹ *Account of Printed Text of New Testament*, p. 261.

² *Guardian*, August 10, 1881, p. 1136; and again, p. 1675.

³ Address to his Diocesan Conference, p. 27, *cf.* p. 6.

⁴ No. 305, p. 32. The Bishop of Salisbury mentions one verse in which 'not fewer than eight changes are made;' but he adds that 'only one of them would be discovered in reading the verse aloud or hearing it read' (*Charge*, p. 20).

appea
omit
are ad
5,788
staten
that
triflin
been
substa
can h
text.³
in the
and p
the p
frequ

A
enum
has l
satisf
as the
need
recen
accou
that
weigh
say a
tribut
the c
C
fond
of E
obed
natur
and
descr
Revi
carel
(pp.
says,
this.
indee

1
entire
3
3

appear, that 122 sentences or parts of sentences are omitted, and that only 10 new passages, mostly very brief, are added.¹ The alterations in the Greek text are said to be 5,788; or in round numbers nearly 6,000.² In the face of statements like these it was scarcely reassuring to be told that the great majority of these textual changes were trifling and unimportant; though, indeed, this must have been the case if Dr. Hort is correct in affirming that the substantial variations 'still subject to doubt' in the Greek can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text.³ In fine; whatever was the main cause of the revulsion in the public feeling, the opposition soon became vehement and general; and critics of all sorts and sizes rushed upon the prey with an eagerness in which fair dealing was too frequently forgotten.

As regards many of the publications which we have enumerated at the head of this article, the tide of criticism has long since swept completely past them. We must be satisfied to give merely a respectful mention to such books as those of Dr. Roberts, Dr. Newth, and Mr. Nicholson; nor need we now return to the consideration of Canon Cook's recently published and elaborate volume, of which a sufficient account was given in our last number. It is obvious, too, that space would fail us if we tried to estimate the critical weight of every article in so lengthy a list. But we ought to say a few words of protest at the outset against some contributions which deserve animadversion for the unfairness or the carelessness of their writers.

One of these minor critics is Mr. G. W. Moon, who is fond of posing as a self-constituted champion of the purity of English, by which is meant that he is a stickler for obedience to stiff grammar rules, against the free and natural use of idiom. The very title of his book is unfair and misleading. He calls it *The Revisers' English*. He describes his undertaking as 'the task of exposing the Revisers' errors.' He perpetually accuses the Revisers of carelessness and ignorance—nay, of 'culpable carelessness' (pp. 7, 9, 38, 39, &c.) 'It certainly passeth knowledge,' he says, 'why *the Revisers* have sent forth such English as this.' But the moment we begin to verify the references (if indeed the familiarity of the well-known phrases does not

¹ *Expositor*, iii. 435. The *Dublin Reviewer* declared that 'forty entire verses' were gone; July 1881, pp. 135, 140.

² Canon Cook, pp. 222, 230. Sir E. Beckett, p. 40.

³ Westcott and Hort, vol. i. p. 561; vol. ii. p. 2.

make such verification needless), we find that, in the vast majority of cases, the Revisers are only the whipping-boys, who are chastised for the offences which the famous authors of King James's version, or their not less honoured predecessors, commit against the rules of Mr. Moon.

Sir Edmund Beckett is a writer of a different order. He does not profess, however, to write in a judicial spirit. His work is more like the speech of an advocate;¹ an excellent specimen of hard-hitting, implacable, uncompromising pleading, directed with great energy to establish the proposition that the Revised Version ought not to be authorized by Act of Parliament. But he weakens his case by overstating it; and by showing too plainly the delight which he feels in the occupation of 'abusing the plaintiff's attorney.' A great number of the changes which he condemns could be defended at once; such as 'lamp' for 'light' in regard to S. John the Baptist (pp. 27, 187); 'the rock' for 'a rock' in the Sermon on the Mount (p. 76); 'wine-skins' for 'bottles' (p. 79); 'anxious' for 'taking thought' (pp. 74, 81, 117); 'broken pieces' for 'fragments'² (p. 91); 'yielded up His spirit' (p. 115, which he calls 'a thing never said by any human being'); and the like. He misunderstands, and then ridicules, the marginal suggestion on Matt. vi. 27 of 'age' for 'stature' (pp. 74, 145). Speaking of the transposition, 'Is it I, Rabbi?' in Matt. xxvi. 25, he says that it is a 'still greater and worse change' than another which he calls both 'a blunder and a crime' (p. 111). He ought to have known that it is only a bit of precision, borrowed from the Rhemish version. He says of the phrase, 'the hell of fire,' that 'nobody ever heard of it before' (p. 59); yet it comes direct from the same old and 'anxiously faithful'³ translation. He complains of the Revisers' 'more complicated and clumsy phrases, such as "a meddler with [read in] other men's matters" for "a busybody," though it is only one word in Greek' (p. 84). Does he mean that the Authorized Version gives 'only one word in' English? On the contrary, it uses precisely the same phrase as the Revisers, 'a busybody in other men's matters'; following the older versions of Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva (1 Pet. iv. 15). The Revisers altered

¹ 'I avowed myself an advocate,' he says in his Reply to Dr. Farrar, p. 4; leaving the public to be the judge. The reasons for many of the changes, which he expresses great anxiety to learn, are supplied in Mr. Humphry's recently published *Commentary on the Revised Version*.

² Compare Dean Vaughan's Sermons, 'Authorized or Revised?' p. 175.

³ Westcott, *English Bible*, p. 266.

just o
'busy
the G
L
the m
that
nearly
has b
repea
the fin
interp
terpre
'illust
the sm
mere
tween
inborn
Revis

Again
the r
occu
instan
presen
'flat,
prete
specifi
not k
these
the A
single
every
T
detail
these
escap
begin
with
with
clearl

¹ T
² N
that h
face (I
two R
so. cle

just one word in the phrase; probably because they use 'busybodies' elsewhere, as a translation of different terms in the Greek (2 Thess. iii. 11; 1 Tim. v. 13).

Let us take another example of the same kind to show the manner of this trenchant critic, who goes about to prove that 'the Revisers have taken all the life and poetry out of nearly every sentence they have altered' (p. 10). The instance has been pointed out in this Review before, but will bear repeating. Near the outset he alights on a small change in the first chapter of S. Matthew (verse 23); 'which is, being interpreted, God with us,' instead of 'which, being interpreted, is God with us.' He says that this change

'illustrates the capacity of the Revisers for spoiling sentences with the smallest possible exertion, and for no visible object. Here the mere transposition of that little "is" makes all the difference between a lively, solemn, and harmonious sentence, and one as flat, inharmonious, and pedantic as a modern Act of Parliament, or the Revisers' Preface' (p. 50).

Again we may retort by asking, How will it be if we take the men of 1611 for judges? The exact Greek phrase occurs six times in the New Testament.¹ In every single instance but the one before us, the Authorized Version itself presents the very translation which this critic condemns as 'flat, inharmonious, and pedantic;' 'which is, being interpreted' in the exact order of the Greek. If this is not a specimen of sheer prejudice, we frankly confess that we do not know where to find one. The Revisers have brought these hard words upon their heads by simply harmonizing the Authorized translators with themselves, and removing the single exception by adopting the order which they use in every other passage.

The *Quarterly* Reviewer is too complete a master of the details of his subject to fall into such palpable mistakes as these. But it would be strange if so vehement an assailant escaped errors of prejudice and sometimes of haste. Thus he begins with a stumble; confusing the acts of Convocation with the acts of its Committee, and the conditions of the one with the regulations of the other.² These regulations were clearly of the nature of bye-laws, drawn up by the Committee

¹ The other five are, Mark v. 41; xv. 22, 34; John i. 41; Acts iv. 36.

² No. 304, p. 308. Canon Kennedy is so indignant at this confusion, that he doubts whether the Reviewer can have read the Revisers' Preface (Ely Lectures, p. 158). Canon Cook complains (p. 220) that the two Revisers who undertook the defence of their text are not themselves so clear on this distinction as they ought to have been; see their

for the general guidance of the Company which it was to complete by co-optation, but of which it continued to be the mainspring and centre. Of course its members retained the power of altering these bye-laws if they found it necessary; which power they used when they substituted the separate publication of two Greek texts for the cumbrous method of indicating changes in the margin. A little further on he represents Tischendorf as saying of Codex D what that critic really says of Bornemann's edition.¹ He assails Dr. Roberts for an erroneous statement which that writer expressly quotes from Dr. Tregelles;² and though he might reply that Dr. Roberts makes it his own by quoting it, he is bound to put the saddle on the right horse notwithstanding. He makes a great point in his third article of the fact that, before his first article was published, he had read through the second volume of Westcott and Hort, and had 'endeavoured to compress into a long footnote some account of' that volume.³ Yet, by some oversight, the quotations which he makes in that note are taken verbatim from the summary which they had printed some months earlier at the end of their first volume.⁴ It is also surprising to find him including *ῥέρονεν* in a list of aorists; and calling the reading *Euraquilo* 'preposterous'; and refusing to exclude female infants from the massacre at Bethlehem; and complaining bitterly of the Revisers for arranging the text in paragraphs instead of verses; and reckoning the revised version of Hebrews iv. 2 in a list of changes, of which he says that 'every one' is 'either a pitiful blunder or else a gross fabrication.'⁵ Let us

pamphlet, p. 32. The Reviewer varies in his later modes of stating this grievance about the margin: see No. 305, p. 9; No. 306, p. 311 ('as agreed upon by the Revisionists at the outset').

¹ No. 304, p. 313. "*Sæpe dubites per ludumne an serio scripta legas,*" is Tischendorf's blunt estimate of the text of that codex.' The Reviewer seems to have been misled by an inaccurate recollection of Scrivener's quotation of the passage; Introd. to Codex Bezae, p. liv. The original occurs in Tischendorf's Prolegomena to his 7th edition (1859), p. cxiii.

² No. 304, p. 327. 'Dr. Roberts assures us,' &c.; see his *Companion to the Revised Version*, p. 62.

³ No. 306, p. 313. Compare pp. 348-50.

⁴ See No. 304, p. 320, note. The note begins: 'While these sheets are passing through the press, a copy of the long-expected (second) volume reaches us. The theory of the respected authors *proves to be*, &c., and then come words copied from their earlier volume; pp. 556, 557. The third article, however, makes up for this defect very completely, by the minuteness of the analysis to which he subjects the work of Dr. Hort.

⁵ No. 305, p. 25; p. 35; p. 17; p. 60; p. 14. On *Euraquilo*, Acts xxvii. 14, compare Bentley, Works, iii. 354, ed. Dyce; and the

pause for
criticisms
cause the
The pa
plain
of the
of 188
Textus
Review
of any
expecte
Sinaitic
two fals
of char
science
'best s
covery
avail hi
had the

It is
twice qu
think) u
and put
fair ana
S. Mark
prefer t
to find
of the fi
a single
speare b
original
that the
ment ev
not one
most sk
revert to

Preface to
the readin
Wordswor
Scrivener's
Bible.

¹ See M
² No. 3
remarkab
Toby; tha
only questi
VOL. X

pause for a moment on this last example of his remorseless criticism. 'The word of hearing did not profit them, because they were not united by faith with them that heard.' The passage is difficult, and the editors are divided; but, as a plain matter of fact, the readings of the text and margin of the book of 1611 have simply changed places in the book of 1881. And what is remarkable, the reading of the *Textus Receptus*, which is so vigorously upheld by the Reviewer, could not, till very recently, boast of the support of any important Greek MS. whatever, though it unexpectedly found an ally a few years ago in the *Codex Sinaiticus*—one of the Reviewer's favourite aversions, 'the two false witnesses,' the corrupted MSS. with the very worst of characters, of whose help he can scarcely have the conscience to avail himself. His own golden rule is, Take the 'best supported' reading.¹ But in this case, up to the discovery of *Codex Aleph*, of which he has forfeited the right to avail himself, this reading which he prefers so emphatically had the support of no good Greek MS. at all.

It is amusingly characteristic of this eager writer that he twice quotes the old *mumpsimus* story (as most people would think) upside-down, to describe the position of his opponents; and puts the following words into the mouth of Dr. Hort as a fair analysis of his discussion on the last twelve verses of S. Mark:—'Thank you for showing us our mistake; but we prefer to stick to our *mumpsimus*!'² We have a worse fault to find with his extraordinary travesty of the characteristics of the five chief uncials as described by Bishop Ellicott. Not a single one of his five phonetic parodies of a line in Shakespeare bears the remotest resemblance to the meaning of the original text.³ Would he seriously tell the unlearned reader that the five oldest and most famous MSS. of the New Testament ever combine to exhibit different forms of error, from not one of which could we extract the true reading by the most skilful divination? And with what satisfaction do we revert to the well-known assurance of Bentley, that the 'real

Preface to Kuenen and Cobet's *N.T. ad fid. Cod. Vat.*, pp. vi, vii. It is the reading of *κ.β.α.*, and of Lachmann, Tischendorf (ed. 8), Tregelles, Wordsworth. As to using paragraphs instead of verses, see Dr. Scrivener's Introduction to his great work, the *Cambridge Paragraph Bible*.

¹ See No. 304, p. 317, &c.

² No. 305, p. 58; No. 306, p. 339.

³ No. 304, p. 314. It is enough to quote the first and last of these remarkable performances. He likens *Codex A* to this:—'Toby or not Toby; that is the question.' And he likens *Codex D* to this:—'The only question is this: to beat that Toby, or to be a tuò.'

text' is 'competently exact even in the worst MS. now extant,' to say nothing of those which many competent writers believe to be the best!

It does not fall within our present scope to discuss the more fundamental defects of those learned articles: the want of a consistent working theory, such as would enable us to weigh, as well as count, the suffrages of MSS., versions, and fathers; and the claim of prescriptive right for the 'text in possession,' as it has come down to us with little change from the first edition of Erasmus in 1516. But we may remark that, on this branch of the subject, he has improved his position in the progress of his argument. In his first article there was something amusing in the simplicity with which 'Lloyd's Greek Testament' (which is only a convenient little Oxford edition of the ordinary kind) was put forth as the final standard of appeal.¹ It recalled to our recollection Bentley's sarcasm upon the text of Stephanus, which 'your learned Whitbyus' takes 'for the sacred original in every word and syllable; and if the conceit is but spread and propagated, within a few years that printer's infallibility will be as zealously maintained as an evangelist's or apostle's.'² In his third article we hear no more of 'Lloyd's Greek Testament.' The 350 years since Erasmus have been lengthened into 1,530 years since just before S. Chrysostom. The phrase 'Textus Receptus' has in general given way to the more comprehensive title of the 'Traditional Text.'³ He thus protects himself to a certain extent against the retort, that as water cannot rise above its source, so the Textus Receptus can rise no higher than its origin in the careless editing of Erasmus, and the few inferior MSS. he used. It was a strange piece of inconsistency to declare that the Erasmian text 'rests on infinitely better MS. evidence than that of any ancient work which can be named,'⁴ and yet to complain bitterly of the limitations by which Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf have crippled their text, and to maintain that even now, after the examination of some hundreds of MSS., our apparatus remains utterly inadequate and incomplete. He mends his hand considerably when he falls back upon the great mass of cursive copies, and rests the claims of the traditional text on the more imposing prescription of 'a thousand and half a thousand years.'⁵

¹ No. 304, pp. 313, 315, &c. Compare pp. 312, 349, 351, &c.

² Works, ed. Dyce, iii. 353.

³ See especially pp. 331, 332, &c.

⁴ No. 304, p. 317.

⁵ No. 306, p. 338.

W
from t
the all
charge
by the
memb

So
some
again
both t
A mat
In eve
minor
Comp
specia
change
'except
an aver
to five,
eight,
opinion
because
exagger
work.

The
109 tim
ing to
scholar
viously
The A
limited,
must ha
compell
censure
frequen
ments
pushed
conscien

¹ 'Th
day' (Re
ing of tw
the Bible
or the o
retaining
Company
gether.

We pass on to ask whether any deductions must be made from the value of the Revised English Version on account of the alleged defection of some among the Revisers, and the charge that changes had been forced on a reluctant Company by the strong and energetic will of some few among its members.

Soon after the book was published it was rumoured that some members of the Revision Company had protested against the number of the alterations made as exceeding both the needs of the case and the limits of their commission. A matter of this kind is seldom of much public importance. In every body where questions are decided by voting, the minority is bound by the act of the majority; and in a Company which consisted entirely of men selected for their special qualifications, and was protected by the rule that no change could be made or retained on the final revision 'except two-thirds of those present approved of the same,'—an average majority, which must have consisted of at least ten to five, and might sometimes reach the number of sixteen to eight, would represent an unusual amount of instructed opinion.¹ The matter, however, is forced on our attention, because it has been used, apparently with a good deal of exaggeration, for the purpose of depreciating the value of the work.

The Bishop of St. Andrews, who was able to attend only 109 times out of 407, made his own position clear by delivering to his diocese a Charge, marked by his usual taste and scholarship, which embodied the remonstrance he had previously addressed to his colleagues in the Jerusalem Chamber. The Archbishop of Dublin, also, whose attendances were limited, through the effects of an accident which his colleagues must have specially deplored, to 63 times out of the 407, feels compelled to qualify his commendations by some words of censure. He reluctantly admits that there is a 'not unfrequent sacrifice of grace and ease to the rigorous requirements of a literal accuracy, which' he 'must regard as pushed to a faulty excess, although such a fault as only the conscientious would commit;' and that 'the demands made

¹ 'The average attendance for the whole time has been sixteen each day' (Revisers' Preface, p. xii). 'If,' writes Dean Vaughan, 'in a gathering of twenty persons, with all the prepossessions of English readers of the Bible strong in them, not seven were found to prefer the old reading or the old rendering, it can scarcely be said that the arguments for retaining it were overwhelming' (Preface to Sermons, p. xiii). The Company for most of the time consisted of twenty-four members altogether. The table of attendances will be found in Dr. Newth, p. 125.

by the Revisers from time to time on the English language prove more than the language in the most dexterous and accomplished hands can satisfy' (p. 22). These two distinguished prelates, however, from the infrequency of their attendance, can scarcely be regarded as the representatives of a protesting minority, but rather as independent critics of a work, in which both were eminently qualified, had circumstances permitted it, to take a leading part. The Bishop of Salisbury, whose attendances (121) were confined to the earlier meetings, during which, as he says, 'all the chief principles of the work were settled,' regards himself 'as responsible, not less than those who continued the work to the end, for all the leading methods adopted by the Company and put in execution during those years.'¹

Dr. Scrivener, on the other hand, who ranks second to none as a master of textual criticism, was absent only eight times altogether out of the 407, being second only to the Chairman in the regularity of his attendance. It is well known also that, as Canon Kennedy says, his part in the great work 'has been large and important;' and his defection from his colleagues would have been a very serious matter. His attitude, however, is not at present quite so certain. He is eagerly claimed as an ally by the *Quarterly* Reviewer and Canon Cook; and there can be no doubt that he would generally represent the conservative side. But for the present he remains, so far as we know, silent.² We shall know his real position better when we receive the promised new edition of his invaluable 'Introduction.' Meanwhile Canon Cook says (p. 223) that Dr. Scrivener was 'systematically outvoted;' and Sir E. Beckett cites the *Quarterly* Reviewer for the statement that 'one of the Revisers' said, 'in effect, and it remains uncontradicted, that Dr. Scrivener was pretty nearly always voted down.'³ The *Quarterly* Reviewer quotes no such statement. The reference can only be to an unlucky paragraph in Dr. Newth, which was unearthed by the

¹ Charge, 1882, p. 15.

² The preface to the Greek text which he edited forms no exception to this silence. Of course, he would be debarred from expressing there his own opinion by the nature of his trust. The publishers' advertisement of the new edition of the 'Introduction' announces that in it 'the chief alterations introduced into the received Greek text by the Revisers of the New Testament will be examined in their relation to the critical principles of Professors Hort and Westcott.'

³ Reply to Dr. Farrar, p. 5. In his longer book, p. 92, he assumes that Dr. Newth's two Revisers, 'on whom this most essential part of the business was by tacit consent devolved,' were *Westcott* and *Hort*. The two whom Dr. Newth mentions, and that most explicitly, are *Scrivener* and *Hort*.

Revi
the te
Scrive
spoke
'if diff
discus
genera

Ag
author
cases,
referr
hand e
dence
carry
a later
'Six L
1875.
that as
Dr. Scr
it 'can
text' (I
Prayer
version
referen
the *Qu*

¹ Ne
No. 304,
confirme
pany, in
Testame
Compan
as they
making
whole sch
influence
Company

² See
Drs. Scr
Kennedy
adds, 'on
mind—na
weight, n
p. 159.
convincin
to wait f
readings,
real judg
in points

Reviewer, and in which he tells us that the duty of stating the textual evidence was 'by tacit consent' devolved on *Dr. Scrivener* and *Dr. Hort*; that of these *Dr. Scrivener* always spoke first, and *Dr. Hort* followed and stated his own view, 'if differing' from that of *Dr. Scrivener*, after which came the discussion, and then the vote was taken; but which way it generally went we are not told.¹

Again it is repeatedly stated by *Canon Cook*, on the authority of *Canon Kennedy*, that in all the most important cases, *Dr. Scrivener* was a steadfast opponent of change.² On referring to *Canon Kennedy's* book, we find very little first-hand evidence in that direction. He relies mainly on the evidence of *Dr. Scrivener's* book of 1874, which does not always carry out his contention; and, moreover, we already possess a later report of *Dr. Scrivener's* opinions in the excellent 'Six Lectures' which he published to popularize the subject in 1875. From this later work we gather, amongst other things, that as regards the Doxology in the Lord's Prayer, on which *Dr. Scrivener* had hesitated in 1874 (p. 495), he now admits that it 'can hardly be upheld any longer as a portion of the sacred text' (p. 124); that, as regards the shortened form of the Lord's Prayer in *S. Luke*, he holds that 'the mass of copies and versions *must yield* in a case like this' (p. 149); and that with reference to the remarkable change in *S. Matt. xix. 17*, which the *Quarterly Reviewer* calls a 'mere fabrication,' 'an absurd

¹ *Newth*, Lectures on Bible Revision, p. 119-20; *Quarterly Review*, No. 304, p. 326; No. 305, p. 7. *Dr. Newth's* account is accepted and confirmed in the authorized statement made by two members of the Company, in their pamphlet on *The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament*, p. 36. They also define with authority the exact position in the Company of *Drs. Westcott and Hort*, pp. 31, 34, 40. A double injustice, as they point out, has been done to those distinguished scholars, in making them responsible for critical principles which they share with the whole school of *Bentley*, and in ascribing to their supposed predominating influence the text lying behind the Revised Version, for which the entire Company is equally answerable.

² See *Canon Cook's* book, pp. 10, 18, 58, 86, 131, 132, 222. No doubt *Drs. Scrivener and Westcott and Hort* represented, as stated by *Canon Kennedy* (p. 47), 'two somewhat different schools of feeling;' but he adds, 'on one conclusion all three critics were assuredly of the same mind—namely, that the value of any reading is to be decided by the weight, not by the number, of the documents which contain it.' Compare p. 159. The *Quarterly Reviewer*, No. 306, p. 376, is rhetorical and unconvincing. The Bishop of *Salisbury* says that *Dr. Scrivener* 'preferred to wait for the second revision' before challenging a final decision on readings, but adds that 'the Version as it stands does not exhibit the real judgment of any of the Revisers. Each one was, many times, outvoted in points which he greatly valued' (*Charge*, p. 18).

fabrication,' 'an absurd saying,' 'never uttered by our Lord,'¹ he now accepts it with the remark that he 'once strove hard to vindicate the common Greek text, and can now do so no longer' (p. 130, and similarly in 1874, pp. 499, 500). We may add that Dr. Scrivener anticipated the 'immediate acceptance' of the change in S. Mark vi. 20 (1874, p. 506; 1875, p. 134), a change resisted by the Bishop of Lincoln (p. 14); that he thinks it 'well-nigh impossible' to regard the moving of the water as a genuine portion of S. John's Gospel (p. 158); that he follows a long and illustrious line of critics in accepting the change in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (p. 193); and that he thinks the alteration probably right in Hebrews iv. 2 (p. 196), on which we have commented above. We need scarcely say that, in all these cases, he is utterly at variance with the *Quarterly Reviewer*. It is certain, moreover, that Dr. Scrivener accepted from the Revisers the honourable task of keeping a record of the changes adopted in the Greek, and preparing the list of those readings which was communicated to the University presses. He also not only edited the Greek text in the form in which it was issued by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, a task which he discharged with admirable fidelity and skill,² but looked over the proof sheets of the Oxford edition which came out under the care of Archdeacon Palmer.³

To turn to another distinguished Reviser; we are told by Sir E. Beckett that the Dean of Llandaff declared publicly at Doncaster that he disapproved of about one-third of the work of the Revisers, and Sir Edmund adds that 'he certainly never has advocated it for public use.' We have no record before us of the address at Doncaster, but what we do know that Dean Vaughan says is as follows:—

'If anyone imagines that a council of five-and-twenty men could uniformly arrive at unanimous conclusions, or counts it a reflexion upon the recent Revision that it should be avowed by persons engaged in it that the results in many particulars were not precisely those for which he himself voted, this is to betray a scanty experience of human dealing even in matters of far less keen anxiety than the text

¹ *Quarterly Review*, No. 305, pp. 13, 57; No. 306, p. 354, note.

² There is one remarkable feature in this book by which Canon Cook is much perplexed (p. 120): viz., that Dr. Scrivener interposes in his text a space before the last twelve verses of S. Mark, though he certainly found no such interval in Beza's or any other old edition. He was bound, of course, to record in the notes that the Revisers had introduced that space into their version; but it is not easy to see on what grounds he could give it a place in his text.

³ See Archdeacon Palmer's Preface, *ad fin.*

or tra
learns
than
he hin
ment,
posse

T
to a v
most
appea
groun
altera
signs
Revis
where
Autho
pretat
'the
and i
phras
still a

It
dissen
'what
ments
of oth

'W
and m
than I
(each
ever s
harmo
will re
stand
of us,
majori
more
of blen
out a l
found
cussing
the ad
drawb

Pr
'Y
acknow

or translation of the Bible. A man of sense and a man of modesty learns to defer to the decisions of a majority, with something better than a sullen or reluctant acquiescence—rather with the feeling that he himself may easily have been mistaken, whether in taste or judgment, whether from defective knowledge or from unconscious prepossession' (Preface, p. x).

These 'modest and sensible' words occur in the Preface to a volume in which Dean Vaughan has put forth one of the most judicious defences of the Revised Version that have yet appeared; judicious because it rests the case on the deeper grounds of exegetical superiority, and not on mere casual alterations in the outward details. In the Preface we can trace signs of a sense of indignation at the treatment to which the Revised Version has been exposed. In the sermons he everywhere prefixes as a text the Revised Version as well as the Authorized, and draws out the improvements which the interpretation derives from the former; sometimes showing that 'the change of rendering is a gain in clearness, in freshness, and in suggestiveness' (p. 176); sometimes that the new phrase 'is the more exact rendering, and is in reality fuller still and more comprehensive' (p. 192).

It is pleasant to turn from vague accusations of unproved dissensions, resting on evidence not worth much more than 'what the soldier said' in *Pickwick*, to read the manly statements of the actual facts, which we gather from the writings of other Revisers besides the Dean of Llandaff.

'What these ten years,' says Mr. Humphry, 'have been to me and my colleagues you can imagine, though imperfectly, yet better than I can describe. . . . I do not know that so large a body of men (each one, moreover, heavily charged with his own private duties) ever spent so large a portion of their lives together in unbroken harmony, in earnest consideration of God's Work' (pp. 7, 8). 'You will readily believe that neither I nor any of my colleagues is able to stand up for the Revision as the product of absolute wisdom. Each of us, times without number, has been outvoted by a "tyrant majority." There is no sentence in our Preface which had our more hearty approval than that which confesses to the existence of blemishes, imperfections, failures; though if each of us had made out a list of such blots, no two of the lists probably would have been found to agree. It cannot be otherwise where many minds are discussing the multifarious details of a long and difficult work, though the advantages arising from their joint counsel greatly outweigh the drawbacks' (p. 21).

Precisely so writes Canon Kennedy:—

'Yes, the existence of blemishes in the revised volume, thus acknowledged (in their Preface) by the collective voice of the Com-

pany, would certainly not be denied by any individual member ; yet if we were severally required to furnish lists of what we regard as blemishes, it is more than probable that no two lists would exactly coincide' (p. 58).

And in his dedication to Dr. Scrivener he says:—

'You and I, dear Dr. Scrivener, have sat together eleven years, often voting, like other Revisers, on opposite sides, but without impairing, as I hope and believe, our mutual regard and esteem' (p. xvii).

All this is precisely what it should have been : what every reasonable person would have expected and desired it to be. It is admitted on all hands that there was abundance of discussion, which was both needful and useful ; but of dissensions and protests and recalcitrant minorities we can detect not the faintest sign or token, except in the declamations of declared opponents.

But to pass beyond the circle of the Revisers, let us turn for a moment to the weighty criticisms of the Bishop of Lincoln, who is alleged to have dealt the book 'the first heavy blow that it received *on points of scholarship*.'¹ We are still pursued by inaccuracy of statement, for the blow dealt by the Bishop of Lincoln was of a different kind. The scholarship of the Revised Version has been criticized by Professor Evans and others ; but the Bishop is rigidly punctilious in limiting his charge 'to the *literalism* of our Revisers' (p. 18), and to the number of the needless changes they have made. He 'thankfully acknowledges' that even as regards their 'literal renderings' they have often done 'great service' (p. 21). His complaint is not that the Revised Version is 'inaccurate,' but that it lacks 'artistic skill,' and other qualities of the kind (p. 24). He objects, as many others have done, to the want of smoothness. A too literal version reminds him of a springless carriage, 'in which you are jolted in ruts with aching bones over the stones of a newly-mended' road (p. 16). He describes the numerous 'small changes' as 'vexatious, teasing, and irritating—even the more so because they are small, as small insects sting most sharply' (p. 25).² In some of his complaints he makes the same points as Sir E. Beckett ; for instance, as to 'wine-skins' and 'toll,' and 'shudder' and 'boon,' and

¹ Sir E. Beckett, Answer to Farrar, p. 5 ; compare his longer book, p. 45.

² These 'tormenting flies' are also in the *Quarterly*, No. 305, p. 62 ; and another of the Bishop's metaphors, that of 'an over-restored or ill-restored building' (pp. 17, 23), is in the *Quarterly*, No. 304, p. 310 ; in Dr. Sanday, *Expositor* iii. 266 : and doubtless elsewhere.

'broken pieces' and 'meddlers in other men's matters.'¹ But though his tone is as becoming as Sir Edmund's is the reverse, we cannot acquiesce in the justice of the censures any more in his case than in the other. He would also rather trust to 'the living voice of the teacher' for explanation (pp. 16, 24) than use what he thinks an awkward word or phrase for the sake of clearness. But this is exactly opposite to the estimate which the Revisers had formed of their own duty. On the whole, however, he would be 'deeply grieved if anything that has been said in this address should be construed into anything like a lack of gratitude for the learned labours of the Revisers,' and especially of their Chairman, all of whom he considers to be 'entitled to the tribute of the reverential homage of the whole Anglican Communion' (p. 32), than which they could not desire a more worthy recognition of their labours. For ourselves, we feel certain that habit will lessen the roughness of the road, and assuage much of the irritation of the numerous changes. 'Even the rhythm of the English,' says the Bishop of Salisbury (p. 21), 'will, I venture to predict, be found not unmusical when it has become familiar, when its weighty utterances are recognized as faithfully exhibiting the Truth, and, it may be, are wedded to Divine sounds by the genius of future Handels or Mendelssohns.'

In Dr. Field's most interesting work, *Otium Norwicense, pars tertia*—another contribution to the controversy of considerable value—that veteran scholar, whose opposition, like that of others, has been greatly exaggerated,² dwells chiefly on the same error, the amount of what he thinks unnecessary change. In his Preface he says that 'public opinion,' while showing 'a strong feeling of appreciation of the sterling merits of the Revision,' exhibits 'equally strong marks of dissatisfaction with certain unlooked-for, and (it might be thought) uncalled-for innovations.' He adds that the Revisers are alleged to have interpreted the 'faithfulness' prescribed to them to mean

'not (as was evidently intended) faithfulness to the sense and spirit of the original, but to its grammatical and etymological proprieties; the effect of which has been, not only to introduce needless and finical changes which jar upon the ear, but also to throw over the general style an air of pedantry and punctiliousness, which cannot

¹ Bp. of Lincoln, pp. 16, 17, 19, 23, 25, 26; Sir E. Beckett, pp. 79, 78, 150, 13, 91, 84.

² We have not attempted to verify by calculation the summary of the amount of his opposition, which is given in the *Quarterly* by a friend of the Reviewer's, No. 305, p. 18, but it appears to be too strongly stated.

but be distasteful to the reader who has been "nourished up" in the plain, homely, and idiomatic English of the men of 1611' (Preface, p. v).

In conformity with this judgment, we meet with such comments as the following: 'The English reader might surely have been left in ignorance of such *quisquilæ* as these' (on Mark xiv. 10, p. 28); 'how the Revisers' translation of Acts xxvi. 28 'is to be extracted from the reading adopted by them seems quite inexplicable: *videant ipsi*' (p. 88); 'to insist upon retaining the order of the Greek text, "faithful is the saying," is mere pedantry' (on 1 Tim. i. 15, p. 124); and the like. But he is very far indeed from being a confirmed opponent of the Revised Version. Sometimes, for instance, he states broadly that 'the rendering of the Revised Version is greatly to be preferred to that of the Authorized Version' (on Matt. xxv. 8, p. 13). And it must be remembered that he is himself almost directly responsible for some of the changes which others have complained of. He tells us that two papers which he addressed to the Revisers, the one on 'conversion' (Matt. xiii. 15), and the other on 'the first recorded utterance of Jesus Christ' (Luke ii. 49), 'materially influenced the final revision of those two passages;' while a third paper which he laid before them (on Acts xx. 24) 'was not so fortunate' (p. v.); and he seems to have been absolutely answerable, in conjunction with Dean Burgon,¹ for the small, but very striking, alteration introduced into the text of S. Mark (vii. 19), where the change of a single letter in the Greek gives rise to a great improvement in the English; '[This He said,] making all meats clean' (p. 23). This change, by the way, is one against which the Bishop of Lincoln (pp. 10-12) argues at length as 'very questionable;' in fact, he arraigns it in the very forefront of his complaint.

It is much to be regretted that the Bishop of Derry's Charge of 1881 has not been republished in a more generally available form than as transferred from the columns of a newspaper by a provincial printer. It contains a great number of acute and instructive criticisms, and we should find it difficult to point to a more judicial summary of gain and loss. 'I venture to say,' he tells us (p. 14), 'that in the Revised Version we have gained a great deal, while we have lost something.' We have gained a purer text; and 'the old Church is all the fairer when the churchwardens' white-

¹ On the last twelve verses of S. Mark, pp. 179, 180. Compare Scrivener's Introduction, 1874, p. 306.

wash has been painfully scraped away.' We have gained from the 'almost new-born' 'critical knowledge of the idiom of the New Testament.' We have gained greatly from the more exact rendering of articles and tenses, and from the more careful discrimination between the different words of the original, and from their more accurate representation in an English dress. We have gained indirectly from the revival of interest in New Testament study; from the fresher light which the clergy themselves will find thrown upon the meaning of Scripture; from the satisfactory proof which this searching scrutiny supplies, that no vital doctrine, no real evidence, no true consolation, has been lost as the result of criticism. On the other hand, 'I should be untrue,' he says, 'to my own convictions, if I did not frankly confess that the Revised Version appears to me to be yet at some distance from the standard of attainable perfection' (p. 17). Here a single instance of his censures must suffice: 'A New Testament without the word *charity*, and all but without the word *doctrine*, tries old-fashioned Christians rather severely' (p. 20). It may be remembered that Dean Stanley admitted that the loss of the word *charity* was 'the greatest sacrifice which the new translators have ventured to offer on the altar of uniformity.'

If we were ourselves to venture, after making this survey, to draw up a balance-sheet of profit and loss upon the whole transaction, we should emphatically declare our strengthening conviction, and should rest it on much the same grounds as the Bishop of Derry, that the loss is altogether outweighed by the profit. It could scarcely be otherwise when we have to deal with the result of protracted labours, conducted through the amicable conferences of many years, by a body of scholars of the highest character, pure in their intention, devoted to their task, unsparing in labour, anxious only to offer the best services within their reach to God, by spending the prime of their lives and the ripest of their faculties on the work of interpreting more exactly the message of the Gospel, and especially of bringing it more correctly within the knowledge of the unlearned and the poor.

Many of the alleged defects, which have been urged *usque ad nauseam*, appear to admit of easy remedy. It might be desirable, for instance, to lighten the margin of a load of matter, which is sometimes superfluous, and which in some few cases many have condemned as mischievous. We cannot help agreeing with the *Quarterly Reviewer* that it is difficult to see what benefit would follow if our margins were to be

permanently encumbered by mere curiosities, like Bethsaida or Bethzatha, in John v. 3; or Melitene, in Acts xxviii. 1; or like the variations in the number of S. Paul's fellow-voyagers (Acts xxvii. 37), and in the number of the Beast (Rev. xiii. 18). Still more might we deprecate the retention of marginal references to such strange intrusions as the piercing of the side, transferred from John xix. 34 to Matt. xxvii. 49; or to such a 'monstrous corruption' as 'his daughter Herodias,' in Mark vi. 22; or to such unlikely variations as are recorded on Luke x. 41, 42; or to the records of the omission in some MSS. of a whole 'forest of' important 'clauses' in the last three chapters of S. Luke's Gospel. Least of all could we be content to see the opinions of 'some modern interpreters' affixed permanently to the margin of Romans ix. 5. It is a smaller matter, but one which it is perhaps worth while to mention, that the Revisers might have practised a wise economy of marginal space by an extension of the method which they have partially sanctioned, when they insert near the beginning of all books in the New Testament in which the sacred Word occurs, the marginal note on 'Holy Ghost,' 'Or, *Holy Spirit*: and so throughout this book.' It has been calculated¹ that 'teacher' stands in the margin over against the word διδάσκαλος upwards of fifty times; 'bondservant' against the word δοῦλος upwards of a hundred times; 'demons' against δαιμόνια about sixty times; while three lines are devoted fifteen times to explain (by a reference) the value of 'a penny.' It would surely have been both easier and better to avoid these repetitions by placing a table of the more frequent variations at the beginning of the book, and calling attention to it (if thought necessary) by a simple numeral in the margin. A precedent for such a table is supplied by the American Revisers, whose suggestions are often neat and clear, in the 'classes of passages' which they have prefixed to the 'list of readings and renderings preferred' by them, and recorded at their desire.

We feel some regret, too, in cases where the change is so far from being 'imperceptible' that the clue is often absolutely lost, and might perhaps in some measure be restored. We find it hard in some other cases to reconcile ourselves to the extreme harshness of the result, when they attempt to reproduce too exactly some irregularity in the grammar of the original, which often arises entirely from the revision of the text. And yet once again we must admit that the

¹ By the *Quarterly Reviewer*, No. 305, pp. 36-38.

sent
in the
junct
has
'and
in M
passa
symp
man'
not
was
antit
Card
he w
I
speci
and
pend
F
fault
tions
peop
argu
some
the
corre
be n
scar
if he
enou
'Rol
of J
whic
the
to-da
'alm
addr
toili
his o
1
Moon
3
3
in Lig
The
the co

sentences of the noble old English version are often weakened in the Revised Version by the over-scrupulous retention of conjunctions and particles. A chorus of complaints, for instance, has been raised against the sixfold intrusion of the word 'and' into our Lord's explanation of the parable of the tares in Matt. xiii. 37-39, and of exactly the same number in a passage of S. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 8-10.¹ We cannot help sympathizing with the clever schoolboy in Cardinal Newman's dialogue, when his examiner asks him why he has not construed the first *et* in a Latin sentence, 'I thought it was only the Latin style, to dress the sentence, to make it antithetical; and *was not English*.'² It is true that the Cardinal makes him construe the first *et* all the same; but then he was only a schoolboy passing an entrance examination.

In all the above cases, however, it is clear that these specimens of 'over-doing' sprang simply from over-anxiety; and the evil, if admitted, could be removed at no great expenditure of trouble.

But we hasten to turn away from these irksome records of fault-finding to acknowledge the great and manifold obligations under which the Revisers have laid all English-speaking people. The critics have not propitiated our assent to their arguments by the alternative translations which they have sometimes been good enough to offer. We are not sure that the Bishop of Lincoln himself would be applauded for the correction which he suggests on Rom. xii. 11, 'in your hurry be not lazy' (p. 29). The new Bodleian Librarian would scarcely have improved the fortunes of the Revised Version if he had been a member of the Company, with influence enough to induce them to begin the New Testament, the 'Roll of birth, or Birth-roll, or roll of descent, or family-roll, of Jesus Christ;' and if they had yielded to the 'regret' which he expresses, that the Revisers did not further *improve* the Lord's Prayer, by rendering 'Give us our morrow's bread to-day' in their text.³ Mr. J. A. Beet, who complains of the 'almost total absence of poetic instinct' in the Revisers, addresses himself to the difficult text, Phil. ii. 6; and after toiling over the passage for four large pages, produces at last his own rendering ('in lack of a better,' as he modestly says):

¹ See *Quarterly Review*, No. 305, p. 29; Sir E. Beckett, p. 88; Moon, p. 5, &c.

² *Idea of a University*, p. 344.

³ This is one of the well-known ancient explanations; see instances in Lightfoot on *A Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, pp. 213, 219, &c. The Revised Version margin gives it less crudely; 'Gr. *our bread for the coming day*.'

'Not high-handed self-indulging did He deem His equality with God.'¹

We are ashamed to dwell on the smaller details of gain by selecting half-a-dozen specimens out of hundreds that are obvious improvements: such as the substitution everywhere of *Isaiah* for *Esaías*, of *Elijah* for *Elías*, and the like; the substitution of *Joshua* for *Jesus* in Acts vii. 45, Heb. iv. 8; the correction of positive errors by the changes, 'It was said to them of old times;' 'nothing worthy of death hath been done by Him;' the removal of misleading archaisms in such cases as, 'I know nothing *against* myself,' &c.; the introduction of such greatly preferable translations as 'our lamps are *going out*;' and such more vivid readings or renderings as 'hazarding' for 'not regarding His life.'² One could fill page after page with such instances as these. But after all it will be found that the real defence of the Revised Version lies deeper than the surface; in the exact scholarship which has unravelled chains of reasoning which the Authorized Version had obscured; in the new light which will be found to rest on whole passages through a more accurate representation of the force of articles and tenses; in the more intimate connexion established between the unlearned reader and the inspired Evangelists or Apostles, by close translations which sound awkward merely because they are strange, but which a longer familiarity will be certain to commend.

In fact, the worst that can be said of them is only what is expressed in the epigram of the Bishop of Lincoln (p. 30): 'They would have succeeded better and have performed more if they had attempted less. Not by doing, but by over-doing, their work has been less happily done.' Never did arrow miss its mark more widely than when they were accused of 'carelessness.' One suspects that their work would have been more satisfactory if they had finished it in less than half the ten years, and at fewer than half the 407 sittings. The constant revision would prove at last a constant snare. Subjecting each verse, each clause, each single word, to separate and repeated microscopic scrutiny, they would naturally yield to the temptation of making each translation just one shade more precise, just one hair's-breadth nearer to the original; of making each phrase cling just a thought more closely to the grammatical configuration of the Greek; of wiping out some shadow of apparent inconsistency in the

¹ *Expositor*, vol. iii. pp. 385, 391.

² Matt. v. 21, 33, &c.; Luke xxiii. 15; 1 Cor. iv. 4; Matt. xxv. 8; Phil. ii. 30.

selection of English equivalents for the original expressions. Each alteration would be taken by itself; each looked but a trifle when regarded alone; and they forgot to calculate that the units would mount up to the appalling total of six-and-thirty thousand changes. In short, the sole standard which they aimed at was the 'maximum of accuracy.' They forgot that the standard which was also prescribed to them was the 'minimum of change.'

It is not easy to say what will be the future destiny of this accurate and learned Version. Some time has elapsed since any voice was raised in favour of its public substitution for the Authorized Version. What we are to do with it is not so clear. The *Quarterly* Reviewer stands alone, we hope and trust, in his eagerness for its summary and absolute rejection. 'The case,' he says, 'is simply hopeless. It is idle—worse than idle—to dream of revising this Revision.'¹ Sir E. Beckett would be satisfied, we suppose, to reduce it to the unauthorized level of an ordinary commentary. The Bishop of Derry is 'convinced that the Revision, with all its undeniable merits, must be somewhat extensively revised' (p. 23). Even Canon Kennedy appears to contemplate a further change (p. 59). The Bishop of Lincoln wishes that certain selected improvements could be transferred to the margin of the Authorized Version, with authority to the clergy to read them as alternatives, and with the possible prospect of their future admission to the text (pp. 31-2). The Dean of Llandaff, on the other hand, protests against subjecting the work to any 'partial or eclectic treatment' (p. vi.); and he agrees with the Bishop of Derry in seeing some reason to fear the advent of a 'new sectarianism, taking the Revisions of 1611 and 1881 as its starting point.'² The Bishop of Salisbury has long used it in his private chapel, and while not wishing it to take the place of the Version of 1611 'in the public service of the Church,' strongly recommends it 'for use in private families and for personal study' (p. 21). The only wise course seems to be, to deprecate all hasty or inconsiderate action. At all events, we must wait till the publication of the Revised Old Testament makes the undertaking complete. That Revision is still in hand. We constantly see notices of the meetings of the Revisers, who can scarcely fail to have watched the course of criticism with anxious forebodings of the time when it will be their turn to submit their own labours to critics as relentless. What effect

¹ No. 305, p. 62.

² Bishop of Derry, p. 17; Dean of Llandaff, Preface, p. xvii.

will be produced on the forthcoming Revision by the reception which has been accorded to the portion now complete? It was a remarkable sign that one of the first persons who entered on the task of criticism was an Old Testament Reviser, the Dean of Peterborough, who commented on the work of his New Testament colleagues with respect but with freedom. His paper is a pledge that the views which he expresses will be fairly represented before the Old Testament Company. The principles which he lays down seem to be sound and judicious, but the proof of their value lies in the application; and the application is still one of the secrets of the future. We can only protest, in the meantime, against the absolute indecorum of assailing the work of these distinguished scholars with words of disrespect and contumely. In all the qualities that are most requisite for such an undertaking, they tower high above the heads of all but a very small number among their assailants. For their protracted, patient, generous labours, they deserve the gratitude of all to whom God's Word is precious, and who wish the Gospel to be proclaimed in England with the utmost clearness which the most exact translation of the message can impart.

ART. V.—THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL IN ECCLESIASTICAL CASES.

1. *Brodrick and Fremantle's Ecclesiastical Judgments of the Privy Council.* London, 1865.
2. *Moore's Privy Council Appeal Cases.*
3. *Report and Proceedings of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Appellate Jurisdiction.* Parliamentary Papers, vol. vii. 1872.

THERE may be an incidental advantage in the delay which has attended the proceedings of the Judicature Commission, if, in the meantime, the existing order of things is better appreciated, and a clearer light thrown upon various subjects which must ere long force themselves upon public notice.

As a slight contribution to that end we propose to consider one only of the many aspects in which the matters at issue may be viewed: the question, namely, how far, apart from any dispute between the Secular and Ecclesiastical jurisdictions, the existing constitution and procedure of the Judicial

Comm
Appea
expect
minder

A
useless
which
of son
dissati
only a
all leg
breaki
which
charge
ception
their o
Church
arrogan
before

No
founda
and ta
function
merely
several
contain

'T
of faith
doctrin
consid
of the
her Ar
liturgy
plicabl
and his
the sub
of the

An
Bisho

'O
tion of
charge
and w
plain
being

VOL

Committee of the Privy Council, as the Supreme Court of Appeal in Ecclesiastical Cases, are such as might fairly be expected to command the respect and confidence of sober-minded Churchmen.

A dispassionate answer to such an inquiry would not be useless, if it only served to dissipate a misapprehension, which is fraught with considerable danger. It is the theory of some, who prefer things as they are, that the present dissatisfaction of the clergy with the Judicial Committee is only a thinly veiled attempt on their part to shake off all legal control, and thus indirectly to obtain the power of breaking with impunity the contracts upon the tenure of which they hold their respective positions. It is a grave charge to bring against a body of men who, with rare exceptions, have won by their moderation the respect even of their opponents; but it is a handy weapon to use against the Church, for to hold out the faintest suggestion of priestly arrogance is now, as it ever has been, to flaunt a red rag before the English people.

Now, in considering whether such a charge has any real foundation, let us first turn to the Judicial Committee itself, and take from its own lips the definition of its appropriate functions and duties. We confine ourselves to two quotations, merely premising that the same view has been reaffirmed in several other cases. The judgment in the Gorham case contains the following:—

‘This Court . . . has no jurisdiction or authority to decide matters of faith, or to determine what ought in any particular to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Its duty extends only to the consideration of that which is by law established to be the doctrine of the Church of England, upon the true and legal construction of her Articles and formularies. The Court applies to the Articles and liturgy the same principles of construction which are by law applicable to all written instruments, assisted only by such external and historical facts as it may find necessary to enable it to understand the subject-matter to which the instruments relate, and the meaning of the words employed.’

And again, in the ‘*Essays and Reviews*’ Case (*Williams v. Bishop of Salisbury*):—

‘Our province is, on the one hand, to ascertain the true construction of the Articles of religion and formularies referred to in each charge, according to the legal rules for the interpretation of statutes and written instruments; and, on the other hand, to ascertain the plain grammatical meaning of the passages which are charged as being contrary to, or inconsistent with, the doctrines of the Church.’

The Judicial Committee, therefore, lays down two definite principles. (1) It disclaims any jurisdiction to deal with purely spiritual matters. (2) In so far as it is compelled, for the purpose of deciding the cases before it, to put an interpretation upon ecclesiastical formularies, it carefully confines itself to the limits of a mere Court of Construction.

What, then, is the ordinary procedure of such a Court? In the simple case of a claim dependent upon the provisions of a legal contract, the Court must obviously arrive at the meaning of the contract itself before it can decide the question at issue. And that interpretation must depend, not only upon the grammatical sense of the words employed, but also, and often to a much greater degree, upon their legal import. The interpretation is, therefore, mainly a question of law; and the legal knowledge and training of the judge, and his consequent capacity of appreciating the principles of jurisprudence, enable him to apply those principles properly to the facts of the case before him.

But to take a more complicated case. Suppose the document is a foreign contract, and therefore governed by foreign law: it would be equally essential to ascertain its legal meaning. But as an English Judge is only credited with the knowledge of the law of his own country, he must have recourse to the aid of external evidence, and for that purpose is driven to depend mainly upon the opinions of foreign jurisconsults, whose education or position entitles them to speak with authority. Thus it has been the ordinary practice of the Judicial Committee in matters of foreign law to direct a reference to persons learned on the subject.

Or the document may be an English document, but may contain, as an integral part of it, some abstruse technical or scientific term. In such a case, until a specific meaning is affixed to the particular term, the document is simply an unknown quantity; and the intelligent appreciation, therefore, of the term of art is the indispensable preliminary to the construction of the instrument. And this, as lying outside the domain of law, must also be proved by external evidence; and especially, 'when' (to quote the words of an eminent Judge) 'terms are technical terms of art, their meaning must be ascertained by the evidence of persons skilled in the art to which they refer.'

And though here again a Court of Construction would be compelled more or less to delegate its task to others, an obvious advantage is obtained when the Judge himself has a learned or scientific education: not because it would liberate

him from the legal rule as to external evidence, but as it would enable him better to appreciate the effect of such evidence when adduced. A conclusion is unlikely to be very satisfactory if it is drawn by one who imperfectly comprehends the premises upon which it professes to be based.

Now, in all such cases the object aimed at is one and the same—viz. to enable the Court which is charged with the duty of construction to ascertain, in the best manner which the circumstances admit, the nature of the subject-matter which it is called upon to construe: a preliminary investigation, which no ingenuity can elude, and with a view to which, therefore, the State has wisely adapted the functions and procedure of its judicial tribunals to the ever-varying subjects with which they have to deal. And, especially in the construction of documents of a technical kind, the Courts have always been content to draw their information from the sources best qualified under the circumstances to supply it, without any prudish adherence to supposed presumptions of knowledge on the part of Judges, which would be rebutted by common sense.

Now to apply these elementary principles to the solution of ecclesiastical questions.

For this purpose we only claim the right to assume that the Church of England is a religious body, holding distinctive doctrines and Articles of Faith, and exercising a discipline of its own over its own members; while it occupies a relation to the State which, though in some respects modifying its action, does not purport to destroy its separate existence.

It would follow on this assumption that the Church, as a religious body, must have its own jurisdiction in matters purely spiritual, and that the action of the State in its relation to the Church ought to be confined to those subjects which arise out of, and are necessarily incidental to, that relation.

This would exclude any jurisdiction on the part of the State to settle matters of faith or doctrine, though it may become necessary for a judicial tribunal, in order to decide whether formularies have been adhered to or not, to ascertain, as a matter of fact, what are the faith and doctrine of the Church.

In these assumptions we claim nothing more than would be conceded by common consent to any other religious community; nothing, certainly, which is not fairly deducible from the definitions as given by itself of the jurisdiction and functions of the Judicial Committee: and the question we

propose to consider is, whether, upon these assumptions, and taking the Judicial Committee at its own estimate, its present constitution and procedure answer the conditions which the Church of England may fairly require.

There are two classes of ecclesiastical questions which come before the Judicial Committee—those relating to matters of doctrine, and those relating to matters of fact. They involve somewhat different considerations. But we propose to confine ourselves to those which relate to matters of doctrine.

With respect to these, it is a truism to say that, before it can be judicially ascertained whether something has been written or spoken which is at variance with the formularies of the Church, some construction must explicitly or implicitly be put upon them. It is equally obvious, even to one who has but a cursory acquaintance with his Prayer Book, and *a fortiori* to any educated and thoughtful Churchman, that that construction must, in almost every case, involve and depend upon questions of theological science and language; and that, therefore, the task which in such cases devolves upon the Judicial Committee must be the interpretation, to a very great extent, of what we shall not be accused of irreverence in calling, for our present purpose, *technical terms or words of art*, which lie outside the province of mere grammatical or legal knowledge.

But very slight reflection will show that the interpretation of ecclesiastical formulæ, while it bears a close analogy to other species of construction, involves many difficulties peculiar to itself, which give it an exceptional character.

In the first place, it deals with cases the results of which cover the widest area. A judicial decision that a particular doctrine is or is not the doctrine of the Church affects, it is almost needless to say, the status of every clergyman in England. Whatever may have been the case in former times, the Judicial Committee now unquestionably claims to exercise the functions of the ecclesiastical law, 'which' (to quote the words of the present Lord Chancellor) 'has always, even in those proceedings which are called, and in some sense are, criminal and penal, had for its object, not the punishment of individual offenders, but the correction of manners and the discipline of the Church.'¹ It will also be remembered that, according to its latest utterance, the Judicial Committee asserts that its decisions form part of the constitution of the Church as by law established.

¹ See *Mackonochie v. Lord Penzance*, 6 Appeal Cases, 433.

I
pecu
If a
as to
to a
impe
endu
Galili
men,
to te
that
their
inflie
more
dese
such
with
mitt
I
are s
pecu
deve
scien
from
we r
the f
cont
inad
of r
gard
exer
whic
But
nece
diffi
disc
part
is in
ordi
app
som
loco
sepa
still

But, besides this extent of area, the results operate in a peculiar manner. They enter into the domain of conscience. If a blunder happens to be committed by a judicial tribunal as to the interpretation of a scientific term, there is no reason to apprehend that the march of science will be seriously impeded; while even the victim of the mistake, if he has to endure Galileo's condemnation, can conscientiously cling to Galileo's comfort. But to proclaim to a large body of earnest men, who hold themselves to be the ministers duly appointed to teach at their peril the whole tenets of the Christian faith, that the enunciation of some dogma is not compatible with their position in the Church of England, may well be to inflict a blow upon their consciences, which would be the more intolerable in proportion as the sufferer is the more deserving of respect. And it will be observed that if on such a point any mistake should really occur, it would be within that very spiritual sphere into which the Judicial Committee so loudly protests that it is forbidden to enter.

But, again, while the consequences of any failure of justice are so grievous, the matters dealt with are those which are peculiarly liable to mistake. A scientific truth, when once developed, can be labelled and put into the pigeon-holes of science, ready for use whenever required. But as we pass from the exacter sciences, through morals, to theology—as we rise from the concrete to the abstract, and yet more from the finite to the infinite—the capacity of clear definition keeps continually diminishing, as language becomes more and more inadequate as a vehicle of expression. Hence the reduction of religious truth into definite formulæ has always been regarded as one of the most abstruse problems which could exercise the collective wisdom of the Church: a problem which that collective wisdom has often declined to solve. But the difficulties which attend the making of a formulary necessarily linger around the interpretation of it when made.

But there is another and perhaps even greater point of difficulty. It is easy to talk of a particular doctrine, and to discuss how far it can be fitted to the Procrustean bed of a particular formulary. But this attempted isolation of a doctrine is itself a prolific source of error. For what in a subordinate sense may be predicated of morals is emphatically applicable to any body of Christian truth. It is not (as some in these days appear to regard it) a kind of spiritual locomotive, made up of distinct parts, each contributing its separate action to the production of an aggregate result, but still capable of being taken to pieces, repaired where defec-

tive, and refitted. It is rather, as its name imports, a living organization, in which each part of the system acts and reacts upon the other, so that any morbid influence, at whatever spot it may originate, soon ceases to be local, and in time pervades and debilitates the whole constitution. Now, if this be so, the correct construction of a particular formulary of doctrine must include, more or less, the recognition of its relation to the other formularies, and the process could not be properly conducted, except by keeping that relation steadily in view. This is, in fact, admitted to some extent by the Judicial Committee itself, though, singularly enough, only with reference to devotional expressions in the services of the Church, when it says 'that the meaning must be ascertained by a careful consideration of the nature of the subject, and the true doctrine applicable to it.'¹

And there remains the further difficulty, that in the interpretation of ecclesiastical formularies the question very often is, not what they mean at the present moment, but what was their legitimate meaning at some antecedent period of time. Not only, therefore, has the interpreter to pursue a path beset with danger, but he has to grope his way under the dim light of an historic past. To give him a fair chance of reaching his destination, he should add to all his other requirements a competent knowledge of the intricacies of ecclesiastical history.

If, then, one of the duties inevitably thrown in certain cases upon the Court of Appeal is to attach a meaning to the formularies of the Church; if the difficulties of attaching that meaning are, having regard to the subject-matter, so exceptionally complex and varied; and if the issues resulting from any miscarriage of justice are so momentous,—is it unreasonable to require, that the Court, so far as it is compelled to act as a Court of Construction, should avail itself of every possible aid from without, and in particular should, in accordance with the ordinary principles and practice prevalent in analogous, though far less important, cases, 'ascertain' (to repeat our former quotation) 'the meaning of the terms of art by the evidence of persons skilled in the art to which they refer'?

That the extent of apprehended danger is not chimerical will scarcely be denied by those who are acquainted with past decisions. In the whole range of Church doctrine none can be conceived of more mysterious or awful import than 'Regeneration' and the 'Presence of the Body and Blood of

¹ See Judgment in the Gorham Case.

our I
effect
of th
Nor
crepa
from
terms
in bo
differ
juris
woul
the d
S
Judic
is con
there
of th
sists
its co
can i
keen
ment
and
to en
rather
that
c. 86
is rec
eccle
elem
the
const
noth
Free
the
mean
to th
most
judic
lous
repr
whic
wou
a t
was

our Lord in the Holy Communion.' But the nature and effect of the former were involved in the *Gorham* controversy; of the latter in the proceedings in *Sheppard v. Bennett*. Nor is it difficult to see, that in both those cases the discrepancy between the opposing views arose to a great extent from the different interpretations given to certain theological terms which occurred in the Articles and formularies. That in both cases no authoritative judgment was given makes no difference in principle; for it was clearly within the presumed jurisdiction of the Court to have pronounced decisions which would have assumed the right of finally settling, as to both, the doctrines of the Church of England.

Such, then, being the functions and the difficulties of the Judicial Committee, let us turn to the materials of which it is composed. We challenge contradiction when we say that there is no guarantee for the possession by its lay members of the slightest theological knowledge or training. It consists of persons holding high political or judicial offices, and its constitution, therefore, insures, as far as human precaution can insure it, the possession of the highest character, of the keenest intellectual powers, and of profound legal attainments. But the very professional pursuits of its members, and the absorbing work by which they have won their way to eminence, would tend, with comparatively rare exceptions, rather to unfit their minds for theological study. It is true that under the Church Discipline Act (the 3rd and 4th Vict. c. 86) one prelate at least, who must be a Privy Councillor, is required to sit as a member of the Committee in cases of ecclesiastical appeals. And so far, therefore, a clerical element is introduced, though, in fact, almost necessarily in the minority. But, apart from this, no English prelate is constituted a member; there is no religious qualification, and nothing to prevent a Jew, a Dissenter, or even an avowed Freethinker, having a controlling voice in the adjudication of the most important ecclesiastical questions. We do not mean, even in such an extreme case, to insinuate a doubt as to the strict impartiality and legal acumen, with which the most unchristian member would endeavour to exercise his judicial functions. He would, we are sure, listen with sedulous attention and studied courtesy to all the arguments and representations, exceptionally interesting from their novelty, which might be adduced with reference to what to him would appear the subtle distinctions and fanciful vagaries of a theology, upon which up to that time he had scarcely wasted a passing thought. We simply demur to his com-

petency. 'Cuique in sua arte credendum.' The Church of England can hardly be expected to repose implicit confidence in the presumed qualification of a tribunal so constituted (however august it may be in other respects) to perform that part of its judicial functions which concerns the interpretation of ecclesiastical formularies and Articles of Faith.

It will be answered, however, that safeguards have been provided by the Legislature which obviate the possibility of such danger. It will be said that, in addition to the provisions of the Church Discipline Act, some of the prelates of the Church have, in cases not coming within that Act, almost always assisted in the decision of ecclesiastical appeals, and that that assistance is now rendered imperative by statute. It is quite true that from time to time, when questions of great importance to the Church have come before the Judicial Committee, various Archbishops and Bishops, members of the Privy Council, have been specially summoned to attend; but, though at liberty to express their views, they did not sit as members of the Court, and were never allowed a vote on the ultimate decision. It is also true that by a very recent statute the presence *as assessors* of one of the Archbishops or the Bishop of London, and of four other Bishops in a certain order of rotation, has been rendered necessary on the hearing of ecclesiastical appeals. This was doubtless a step in the right direction, in so far as it admitted the ecclesiastical element to be necessary for the proper solution of ecclesiastical questions, and increased the probability of the theological aspects of any point in controversy being fairly brought under the cognisance of the lay tribunal. But it was a retrograde movement in another respect; for by legalizing the assessorship it virtually tended to deprive the Church of any governing voice in decisions which so materially affect her spiritual interests. And at the best it only made the prelates 'assessors,' without imposing any obligation upon the actual Judges to adopt their opinions or to bow to their advice. It was, if it be not irreverent to say so, the addition of a body of unpaid counsel of the highest eminence, but who unfortunately do not plead in public.

For any benefit which the Church might otherwise have derived from the intervention of those who may be considered in a sense its representatives is to a great extent neutralized by the special mode of procedure, which, in obedience to the traditions of the old Star Chamber, the Judicial Committee has thought fit to maintain. In the case of an individual

who n
pare
comp
notic
tende
condu
no pa
porta
The e
exten
them
of th
as we
is pu
judgm
but u
point
with
ough
Cour
of Lo
but e
his in
And
invol
fit to
publi
which
ultim
trary
repr
rule,
cases
mem
matt
mitte
of op
has t
view
secre
glim
defen
So fa
is fai
'who

who may be defendant to an action, it lies upon him to prepare his own line of defence, and he cannot be heard to complain if any material point in his favour has escaped notice or been feebly urged. But where a decision is intended to operate on a much wider scale, and to bind the conduct and affect the consciences of multitudes who are no parties to the legal proceedings, it becomes of vital importance that it should command respect as well as obedience. The degree of unanimity of the Judges, and the grounds and extent of the differences of opinion which may exist among them, affect in such a case materially the force and authority of the judgment itself. The opinions can thus be weighed as well as numbered. But for that purpose the one essential is publicity. It can thus only be distinctly seen that the judgment was based, not merely upon the clearest evidence, but upon the fullest appreciation of everything relevant to the points at issue, and also seen how far it was in accordance with the conclusions of those in whom the greatest confidence ought to be placed. And such is the practice in every other Court of Appeal in England. In appeals before the House of Lords the judgment of the House represents the majority; but each Peer who takes part makes a public statement of his individual opinion, generally accompanied by his reasons. And where (as is not unfrequently the case if an appeal involves difficult points of law) the House of Lords thinks fit to summon the Judges, they also deliver their opinions in public, so that the actual advice given, and the reasons on which it is based, precede and throw their light upon the ultimate decision. In the Judicial Committee, on the contrary, *one* judgment only is delivered, which, though in fact representing the voice of the majority, purports, as a general rule, to be unanimous; and though in several exceptional cases a statement has been added that one or other of the members present did not concur, such an addition is a matter of indulgence and not of right, and no hint is permitted to be given of the nature or reasons of the difference of opinion. Similarly, in the case of the assessor prelates it has transpired that they are allowed to express their several views; but they do so within closed doors, and in solemn secrecy, no one being permitted to know what passes, no glimpse being afforded of the opinions expressed, or of the deference (if any) paid to them by those who alone decide. So far, the old standing order of the Privy Council of 1627 is faithfully adhered to, even in the nineteenth century, that 'when the business is carried according to the most voices,

no publication is afterwards to be made how the voices and opinions went.'

But if Churchmen are expected to acquiesce in the proceedings of a State tribunal, on the ground that in all matters connected with faith or doctrine the theological learning and habits of thought, which are admitted to be important factors in a right decision, are sufficiently supplied by those whom we may call the Church's representatives, is it too much to suggest that, while it is difficult to acquiesce in, it is impossible to reverence, in such a case, the unknown? Is it unfair to urge that the admitted incompetency of the secular Judges to act alone only makes it more imperative that the proceedings of those who are supposed capable of supplying the defect should be thrown open to the public gaze, so that the value, power, and influence of the legislative safeguards may be gauged, and that the absent clergyman, whose living or conscience may perish, may at least be allowed to perish by the light of day?

But matters do not rest there. In so far as the construction of ecclesiastical formularies is absolutely necessary—and beyond that absolute necessity no judicial tribunal should ever dream of venturing—why should the legal principle be inapplicable, that the meaning of a document requiring special knowledge should be referred to those whose special training and education render them conversant with the subject to which it relates, leaving still to the Court of Construction its legitimate function of applying the facts of the particular case to the previously ascertained meaning of the instrument?

How that end may best be attained is beyond our province to determine. Some have suggested the appointment of a body or bodies of referees, to whom the interpretation of what we have called theological terms of art might from time to time be referred: an extension, in fact, of the power given by the original statute¹ which constituted the Judicial Committee, of 'referring matters to be examined and reported on.' Others, that the voice of the Church itself should be invoked, speaking through some duly accredited organ. A third method, which we fear is practically impossible, would be the readjustment of the proportions of the clerical and lay elements in the Judicial Committee itself. Be this as it may, it is of pressing importance that something should be tried. At present, no doubt, the politic forbearance of the Judicial Committee has done much, as to matters of doc-

¹ 3 and 4 Wm. IV. c. 41, sect. 17.

trine, but the advancement marks the importance so vital to the ordinary

It is any at the result of introduction Church the St confound documents however modify scientific be allowed canons theory a step would only p laries or oug the elu it must at least of its

We in the judgm party adjust would that t ecclesi with c inevit a start true to say involve is to sa

trine, to avoid needless friction between Church and State ; but the risk of collision daily increases as the tide of advancing Radicalism is steadily effacing the ancient landmarks ; and it is useless to disguise the danger which lies in the immediate future, if the Church is still to retain, in matters so vitally affecting her separate existence, her present subordinate position.

It has been said, however, and on very high authority, that any attempt to appoint referees would have the inevitable result of creating a Court of Legislation which would virtually introduce new formularies, alter the faith and doctrine of the Church, and thus unsettle the relation in which it stands to the State. But such an objection involves the fallacy of confounding the alteration with the interpretation of a document. It is no more suggested that a body of referees, however constituted, should be armed with authority to modify an existing Article of Faith than that, in the case of a scientific term, the philosopher who might be consulted would be allowed to interpret it, not according to the acknowledged canons of science, but in harmony with some newly hatched theory of his own. The referees would have no power to go a step further than the tribunal which directed the reference would itself be compelled to go, with or without them. The only point to be considered would be, what certain formularies may have said, or omitted to say, not what they might or ought to have said. The sole object would be to transfer the elucidation of a theological problem from those to whom it must remain more or less a dead letter to those who would at least have a better chance of understanding the principles of its solution.

We do not deny that there might be practical difficulties in the formation of a body capable of exercising an impartial judgment and of rising above the denser atmosphere of party prejudice. The settlement of its procedure, and the adjustment of its relation to the tribunal which sought its aid, would doubtless require grave consideration. But to insist that the attempt is hopeless, because the interpretation of ecclesiastical formularies, even within such narrow limits and with every safeguard against abuse, must insensibly but inevitably glide into their change or modification, is to suggest a startling conclusion, from which the Judicial Committee, if true to its own declarations, would instinctively recoil. For to say that the mere interpretation of formularies necessarily involves the resettlement, to any extent, of faith and doctrine, is to say that it involves that which has hitherto been by

common consent confined to the spiritual domain of the Church. If it be true, we are confronted by the dilemma, either that that interpretation should in some way be referred to the decision of the Church itself, or that the performance of a duty which lies within the strictly spiritual province should be committed to a body of men who may not even nominally belong to her communion.

As we have confined our remarks to the Judicial Committee, we have not adverted to the extreme importance of improving, as far as possible, the constitution and procedure of the Courts of First Instance, so as to avoid the frequency of appeals, by the substitution of machinery less exposed to adverse criticism on the part of Churchmen.

It remains only to notice one other argument (if so it may be called) often urged for the purpose of keeping things quiet. We are told that the Church of England has no right to complain, because, after all, she fares better than other religious communities. They, it is said, in so far as they are concerned with particular trusts or endowments, are amenable to the ordinary tribunals, which, as Courts of Construction, may be called upon to construe and enforce the trust deeds. This is no doubt a fact which certain Churchmen will do well to bear in mind before they are tempted to cast longing looks towards Disestablishment. But it has little application to the existing state of things. For not only are such cases amongst other religious communities of comparatively rare occurrence, but when they happen they entail very different consequences. In one case, indeed (Lady Hewley's Charity), in which the decision affected a large number of Dissenting congregations, the Legislature came to the rescue, and cut the knot by legalizing the misappropriation of the intended bounty. But, generally, the point decided would only apply to the individual case; and if the Court happened to misrepresent the supposed faith or doctrine of the sect, the mistake might elicit a protest, but would more probably raise a smile. It is at once the glory and misfortune of the Church of England that in this respect she stands at a great disadvantage, as compared with the sects. The sectarian, with his empty wallet, may sing fearlessly in the presence of the robber; while the Church of England, the custodian of the faith once delivered to the saints, with her pride of Catholic ancestry, her historic continuity, and her rich treasure of creeds and liturgies and formularies, is compelled to stand on her guard, for the simple reason that she has so much to lose.

Pa

THER
teache
the ex

'F
busy w
comple
parting
and p
and in
them p

Of th
his gr
charac
a ma
tions,
health
of he
and a
sap ri
sixty
reserv
worki
cared
sight
under
with
bored
did n
not fe
period
then
a prin
see h
of go
the c
perse
to the

ART. VI.—EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY.

Parochial and Cathedral Sermons. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. (Oxford, 1882.)

THERE is true insight into the character of the religious teacher in the words which Edward Irving takes to describe the excess of action and defect of thought in busy men :—

‘From the Ministers of the Gospel, especially those who are not busy with outward visible works (for all such I find to be scourged completely out of the capacity either of receiving seed or of imparting it), but from those who are diligent in meditation, and study, and prayer, and the other works proper to our vocation of teachers and instructors—from such I have found the greatest profit in hearing them preach and in hearing them speak.’

Of the great theologian and controversialist who was laid in his grave on last S. Matthew's Day, it was not the least characteristic feature that, with the incessant laboriousness of a man of affairs, a profuse correspondence, infinite distractions, the daily irritation of frivolous and morbid as well as healthy demands on his direction, the cumbrous accumulation of heavy books and fugitive papers which besets an editor and author, the fresh growth of sympathy which made the sap rise at the touch of each new springtime in more than sixty years of manhood, nevertheless the scholar secured a reserve of leisure for thought, the ascetic made time every working day for discipline, and the recluse lived as if he only cared for prayer. Hence no one, not even the most near-sighted critic, was disappointed by Dr. Pusey. We can understand men of another temperament being impatient with him, vexed, disposed to pass on and do without him, bored—but disappointed never. He raised no hopes which he did not satisfy, and kindled no imagination of which he did not feed the flame. Circumstances, time after time, at many periods of his life, cast the deepest shadows on his home ; and then again the fierce excitement of a combat, in which he was a principal, would girdle his name with fire, and men would see his head, like the helmet of Achilles, alight with a mist of gold, and flames breaking through the mist. People in the country heard of him as a man of sorrows, a victim of persecution, a mighty champion brought to bay and fighting to the bitter end against any odds, and they came to Oxford

to see him ; and undergraduates knew him only as the latest saint in modern history, and marvelled to see him in the flesh. But none were disappointed. Some saw him for the first time as he came forth from his widowed home. He was unlike any figure of sorrow they had ever beheld : shrunken, pale, withered, creeping through the chill air as if afraid to walk in a world to which he no more belonged. He climbed up the steps of the University pulpit as if he dreaded to look down on the sea of faces and meet their eyes, and he began to preach feebly, with a hollow voice gathering volume as it went, in a crushed sepulchral tone, till every ear slowly vibrated with the monotone of his prayer, and every heart was hushed with a sense of awe as if it were made an involuntary witness of a man of affliction in his hour of loneliest communion with God. This was the impression made on many a young man fresh from the joyous success of life in a public school ; and no wonder that Oxford, with this occasional apparition of Dr. Pusey, presented to him an idea absolutely new. The lapse of time had its mellowing touch. The crushed figure lifted itself and even gained a certain robustness and spring ; and the animation of fresh contentions, and the generous affection which went out to a new generation, took off the dry, death-like ashes from his head and made him smile again in the face of sympathizing multitudes, who rose and uncovered as he stood up, and crowned him with acclamations as he sat down. But no one observing him submitted to all these crucial experiments of character was ever disappointed in Dr. Pusey.

This irrefragable consistency of character is, far and away above all material consistency of circumstance, the secret of the power of his name as a link between two generations of English Churchmen. There is no doubt something highly honourable and impressive in the fact of his abiding in one official residence for fifty-four years, and holding his own in spite of the severest strain on the part of friend and foe to prove by incontestable logic that the post was untenable. The accident of a long life and a singularly produced experience, which to most men gives a power of intuition and prophecy, would account for a great deal of his representative character ; but no such accident will make a man the principal figure of the Church of England of the nineteenth century, as Dr. Pusey is. A statesman who has survived his own generation may be a storehouse of traditions, an expert in precedents, and a mine of wealth to political biographers ; but, for all the influence of a living mind, may be worth no more than

a fossi
calibre
men l
Lord
line o
court
show
Dr. P
which
a per
scruti
Lidd
each
would
moral
memo
cand
shado
ful fa
their
later
age, a
Oxf
again
unwo
his p
by m
or Fo
called
the 27
of th
centu
Amo
cerem
any p
they
honou
if it
Time
debat
floor
Such
thoro
A
of po

a fossil in the Cabinet of a Minister of State. Men of higher calibre than the volatile egotist Brougham—sound and solid men like Lord Lansdowne and the Duke of Wellington and Lord Russell—may easily outlive their influence, even in a line of life where personal blemishes are not brought into court in the review of public virtue. It needs no words to show that in a public life so full of Christian professions as Dr. Pusey's, and with so vast a background of the inner life, which, if hidden at all, was hidden in *light*, nothing less than a perfectly consistent growth of character could satisfy the scrutiny of two generations. If Cardinal Newman and Dr. Liddon should bring their observations of the man alongside each other, and compare their notes of 1830 and 1880, there would be found, we undertake to say, no discrepancy in their moral estimate. The elder friend with his retentiveness of memory and acute discernment would be seen with luminous candour to set his recollections in the light without the shadow of a snow-flake to chill his love; the gracious, cheerful face of the older man would tell the cloudless purity of their friendship; and the younger witness of Dr. Pusey's later life in the widowed and almost childless home of his old age, and in his persevering preaching of old truth in modern Oxford and in the era of the Ritualists, would take heart again, to think that so fine a mould remained unbroken and unworn to the very end. Dr. Pusey, who would never have his portrait taken, could not prevent his name being filched by more Englishmen than ever borrowed the names of Pitt or Fox, though they were incomparably fewer than those who called themselves after John Wesley; and the hold which the *ἐπώνυμος* of his party maintained over the motley crowd of the Churchmen of the latter portion of the nineteenth century was not due to the courtesy of the younger race. Among them were rougher spirits than would stand on the ceremony of respect for age, and hands-hard enough to resist any parental tenderness that would bar them of the liberty they fought to win. Retirement with dignity, peace with honour, was never offered him; and he would not have had it if it were. The Church Union and the columns of the *Times* were his House of Commons; and there he would debate, and be jostled by younger men, and stand on the same floor with them despite his past achievements and his age. Such a position would have been impossible but for the thoroughness and immaculate consistency of his life.

And this is all the more remarkable because of his lack of political insight and sagacity. We have called him a man

of affairs ; and so he was, so far as being an administrator of large concerns, lying well beyond the sphere of home. But he had no gift of managing, no finesse ; was too simple even to be reticent and reserved ; could not educate his party ; had dull perception of the effect of a word or act on the public humour ; was as destitute, perhaps, as any man of his profound experience could be, of that sagacity which goes for prophecy ; and absolutely without that electric imagination of Hurrell Froude, which discovers meteors while slower understandings are counting figures ; or of Faraday, of whom a German savant wrote that he smelt the truth. Or, to compare him with a mind cool and unimaginative, if Dr. Pusey had possessed a tithe of the political sense of Archbishop Tait, the Public Worship Regulation Act would probably not have seen the light ; and the dislocated evidence, which perhaps will be found to give an excuse to the Commissioners for doing nothing, would not have been tendered by witnesses on the Catholic side to the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission.

Again, it would be curious to note how much the influence of a leader is condensed by so slight a mechanism as that of axioms, epigrams, and aphorisms, and other good sayings, or by brilliant, limpid, eloquent, inimitable utterances, whose echo comes back on the ear at every mention of his name. As long as the English language lasts, Newman will be a name among the eloquent. Perhaps, though not so certainly, Keble will retain his place among the poets. Statesmen and party leaders retain younger men under their banner by the fascination and tenacity of these gifts. The provident use of such vehicles of thought is a life assurance. It secures a wealth of influence in old age and after death. Sir Philip Francis, Robert Hall, Edward Irving, George Canning, Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Derby, Richard Cobden, Mr. Bright, are examples of this. It is an accident, no doubt ; but has its worth as an element of influence. Some men are so great as not to need it. Sir Robert Peel could do without it. Mr. Gladstone does without it. Hurrell Froude had it like jewels in the matrix and gold in the sand ; but, if his biographer in the *Times* be right in saying that he could write nothing under thirty pages, no wonder this element of influence is lost in the prolixity of Dr. Pusey. The best that can be said of his style of English prose is that it is characteristic. The matter and the man is in every page, but nothing more. His style, if he had one, does nothing to 'adorn the doctrine.' Strange that Dr. Mill, the greatest theologian of modern Cambridge, the *malleus hæreticorum* as

he u
But,
out
gene
serm
reple
work
The
cade
invol
out
sugg
whic
joy.
descr

feelin
which
on s
effect
ever
earne
when
of the
the s
restle
and o
of ide
goes
way s
an in
thoug
but to
with
as mu
seen
conta
and o
She i
She h
inwar
and o
order
her.
forwa
sit an
oblig

VO

he used to be called, should have been equally unadorned. But, style or no style, the books of these divines are quarries out of which skilled workmen will get building-stone many a generation for the edifying of the Church. The volume of sermons which we have named at the head of this article is replete with beauty of a kind, and yet no one would call it a work of art, or unconsciously true to the principles of art. The voice of the preacher was not unmusical, but false cadences prove the absence of an ear. The sentences are involved and not always coherent; quotations are tumbled out unrhythmically; there is no reserve or delicacy, which suggests without elaborating; and few gems of subtle thought which you take into your hand and they make you smile for joy. But he had other gifts, which Professor Mozley finely describes:—

‘What keeps a congregation fixed and absorbed is a preacher’s feeling what he says, and being himself, as it were, in the words which come from him. Reality is the powerful and moving element on such occasions. Reality is of itself always striking, always effective. There is a sympathetic impulse always felt as soon as ever the mind recognizes the fact that the person speaking is in earnest; he is immediately the centre of all minds around him when this is seen; there is life and intenseness in the whole scene of thought, just as when a wire vibrates, or a spring leaps and fastens the stray material that comes near it. The wandering, scattered, restless images of human fancy are stayed; the thoughts that go in and come out and come near and are lost again, the flitting shadows of ideas, the imperfect, half-formed and ever-changing scenery which goes on within every ordinary human mind, are then for once in a way stilled and fixed. . . . It is the power of earnestness. There is an instinct by which persons feel when the mind from which the thoughts are issuing is a real one—one not wanting to unfold itself, but to do them good, one that is absorbed in a task and identified with a purpose of love. This is seen and felt by the internal sense as much as any outward object is by the external. And when it is seen and felt the effect is immediate. This temper comes into solid contact with their souls in a way in which no other can. It touches and calms them. Intensity is the want which human nature feels. She is right glad to enjoy it by substitute, though it be for an hour. She has no pleasure in the wanderings and disturbance of her own inward domain; she tolerates it only because she is weak and frail and cannot stop it; she has not resolution to master her own disorders and inconstancy, and therefore she carries them about with her. But let any come and do this for her, let any power come forward which only requires her passive acquiescence, and she will sit and give it gladly. Let anyone arrest her attention, and she is obliged to him for it.’

The question will still be asked, Was Dr. Pusey a great preacher? If a preacher be a prophet, rising in critical periods of a nation's lifetime, and interpreting the mind of God to his generation with an insight into the Divine Will, and an enthusiasm for humanity, and a burning love to break the bands of sin, and a tenderness constraining men to repent, and a joyousness in the fruition of eternal life which commands the highest truth in transparent purity to all beholders—then Dr. Pusey, though not the greatest, is the greatest but one, in his generation of English preachers. The ideal sermon is an ethical translation of supernatural truths from the language of scientific dogma into forms convenient for daily practice. It rests on one or more doctrines of revelation; works out from them towards spiritual phenomena; shows their relation to human temptations, necessities, and desires; and, dissecting with the finest analysis the subtle organisms of the soul, brings the whole power of those Divine Truths to bear upon the conscience, understanding, affections, and will, for conviction, enlightening, comfort, and inspiration of motive. Few preachers have impressed his generation more powerfully with the reality of God's relation to human life than he of whom we write. Living as he did among old-world books, making his library his home, recalling on each fresh occasion what would be the thoughts of Athanasius, or Gregory, or Tertullian, and what would be the action at a given point of Cyprian, or Augustine, or Ken, or Andrewes, as naturally as a speaker in the House of Commons would refer to Walpole or Burke or Pitt; and although he might have sat to Bellini for a model of S. Jerome in his study; yet few recent preachers have done more to illustrate the necessity of modernism in preaching, as in every other art. No one, hearing him in his best days in a West End London church, could say that he was 'a schoolman dug up.' More than any preacher we can remember he had the modernism of S. Chrysostom, whose homilies, read in a dead language, enable us to hear with a living ear and tremble with a living heart at the voice which thunders at the vices of the church-goers at Constantinople, and the indignation which, stormfully breaking away from the old text, drives its spear home into the new fashions of his own age, and draws blood from souls whom he has made ashamed for new follies of the day. There was at times something archaic in Dr. Pusey's method, resembling a meditation spoken in a monotone at one breath, without break, or artistic periods. He would roll on with more volubility than distinctness, careless of his audience,

ponder
but afte
of whic
nothing
rebuke
idols o
impuri
giving
assailed
with th
own flo
ture an
particu
The I
occur
with v
but, a
shaded
dwells
'Guar
the ba
all Ca
The
angels
note i
come
power
in 18
'Kno
the p
reviv
Day

'I
of thi
tiona
our c
Mode
prese
them
nor h
in the
pract
ligiou
privi
to co
our C

ponderous with quotations, abstruse and mystical in thought; but after all it was modern London he faced, the London out of which the 'Society papers' now make their fortune; and nothing was too decent and nothing too indecent for him to rebuke with the white heat of S. John the Baptist. The idols of fashionable English life—luxury, freethinking, riches, impurity, neglect of servants and the poor, selfishness in almsgiving, worldliness in every form—these are the vices he assailed; and it was the Christian English gentleman, affronted with the sight of these enormities in men and women of his own flesh and blood, rather than the student of Holy Scripture and the Doctor of the Church, that led him straight to a particular devotion to Christ on His Throne of Judgment. The Eucharist, penitence, and the power of the keys may occur to some as the special portions of the Catholic creed with which his name, in controversy at least, is identified; but, as a fact, his preaching is deeply coloured, rather than shaded, by the judgment day. The thought of the judgment dwells in him richly. Where most men would say reverently, 'Guardiamo, e passiamo,' there 'delightedly dwells' he. It is the background of all his pictures of divine love, as it is with all Catholic minds; but with him it is the foreground often. The principal figure is the 'Son of Man, and all the holy angels with Him, upon the throne of His glory;' his deepest note in his hymn of praise is, 'We believe that thou shalt come to be our Judge;' and the key to his attractiveness and power in converting souls may be found in the motto he chose in 1839 for his Brighton sermon on the Day of Judgment, 'Knowing the terrors of the Lord, we persuade men.' In the preface to this sermon he states his deliberate intention to revive the disused practice of insisting on the reality of the Day of Judgment:—

'It is for the clergy especially to consider how far this lax state of things may be owing to their having omitted to inculcate proportionably the Day of Account. The Apostles from whom we derive our creeds placed it among the chief articles of the Christian faith. Modern schools have tried a different way: with what success our present condition may testify. Certainly, if men will be honest to themselves, the present state of things among us is not satisfactory, nor have the effects of a modern popular system been what they would in their first hopefulness have anticipated. On the contrary, religious practice has, on a broad scale, oftentimes declined, as a sort of religious teaching has increased, and the inculcation of motives and privileges been substituted for that of detailed duties and judgment to come. The full effects of this system can hardly be visible in our Church, in which our defective teaching, one way or the other, is

ever corrected in a degree through her own silent teaching in her creeds and her prayers. They are fearfully visible in large bodies of those who have left the Church, who have no such corrective, and who, having begun in a misguided and unsubdued earnestness, have ended in losing even the moral probity which was once in the main the characteristic of our countrymen. But there is, in truth, no compendious way of being religious ; it is not by forming frames of mind, and feelings once for all, or even by cultivating these, that people become or remain religious, but by religious actions done in the fear and through the grace of God. Heaven must be won step by step, by the vigilant and careful walking of persons who stand in awe and (in that degree) "sin not," as knowing that "God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or bad."

It is characteristic of Dr. Pusey that, because he thus intensely thought of the judgment of God, he was at the same time so deeply wounded by the false judgments of the world in a controversial age, and so meek and patient under the injury. If he rose in indignation against his slanderers, it was not in the passion of injured innocence, but with a sweep of the hand which would abolish these scandals from the sight of the great Judge. 'Take these things hence ; make not *my Father's* house an house of merchandise.' In a fine sermon in his latest volume on the sin of censoriousness, where the treatment of the subject is marked by great delicacy, his teaching is pervaded with the light of the final judgment by Christ:—

'All judgments are rash which are made by those accustomed to judge their neighbours rashly, or by those who have been on the lookout for any fault, or who expect or are accustomed to find it. Each act of rash judgment prepares the way for another. . . . But such judgments, besides that they are rash and unloving, have this special evil that they intrude themselves into the prerogative of God. He only Who sees the heart can judge the heart. Angels cannot read man's heart ; devils judge only by the outward acts or looks. "Who art thou," God says, "who judgest another's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." The heart is the sanctuary of God. God alone can enter there. To God alone its secret corners are light. God alone can count all its motions. A labyrinth it is to itself. How much more to thee ! Who well nigh knows his own heart ? How difficult it often is to people to tell which of two motives sways them ! How often will tender consciences suspect their own motives, even when they are really moved by good ! How are they puzzled and distressed as to some secondary motive, or mistake a passing emotion for their real motive ! And yet into this secret place where God holds His court, which, until *the* Day of Judgment shall close all judgment of man, is closed to man, man will in his

fancy
tives
them.

A
hand

they
will a
has h
we sh
Chris
Who
quest
as to
wheth
outw
of J
sinne
with
be cl
In th
judg
of th
Thy

T
Euch
Doc
solit
storn
vulg
the i
riors

impo
flood
by th
whic
now

'Nea
repri
pape
was
tradi
And
'Th

fancy enter, and rule and decide and pronounce upon the secret motives, as if he were Almighty God, or as if God Himself had revealed them.'

And then, of taking unkindly views of another second-hand, he says :—

'Happy were we, did people receive truths of faith as firmly as they do the conjectures of idle imaginings. Yet thy neighbour will answer in the Day of Judgment for the rash judgments which he has himself formed. He cannot answer for thine. My brethren, we shall, each one of us, stand one day at the judgment-seat of Christ. We shall be judged as we have judged. Our Lord says it, Who now is our Advocate, and then shall be our Judge. The question then will be, not as to the acuteness of our judgments, not as to our penetration, nor whether we were right or wrong, but whether we loved. . . . In that day one grain of charity will outweigh the acuteness of the whole world. Let us imitate the love of Jesus. He, the Judge of all, while in the flesh judged not sinners. He bore with them. He bears with us. He, by bearing with them, won them. It is not long to wait. All secret things will be clear then. Then shall we have knowledge, if here we have love. In that day it will profit thee to have judged one only, thyself. To judge ourselves and not to judge others is the way not to be judged of the Lord. Show mercy to thyself by not judging thy brethren. Thy mercy on thy neighbour will be poured back in mercy on thyself.

Those whose memory goes back to his sermon on the Eucharist, and the rough handling it received from the Six Doctors, will recall a tender passage, which sounds like the solitary note of a plaintive bird in the intervals of a bitter storm, wherein Dr. Pusey shudders at the thought of the vulgar outrage which will be done to sacred truth. It is not the injustice to himself at the hands of men who are his inferiors, but pain for the dishonour of his Master :—

'It is with pain that the following sermon is published. For it is impossible for anyone not to foresee one portion of its effects—what floods, namely, of blasphemy against holy truth will be poured forth by the infidel, or heretical, or secular and anti-religious papers with which our Church and country is at this time afflicted. . . . And now may God have mercy on this His Church.'

It is a significant fact that

'Nearly 18,000 copies of the sermon were sold at once, besides the reprint of the whole sermon in the *Sunday Times* and another newspaper. The cessation of blame upon the appearance of the sermon was noticed by others and publicly stated at the time without contradiction.'

And

'The absence of any sound of objection to the second sermon (1853)

which contained the self-same doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, only enunciated more dogmatically than it had been in the first, showed that even those who condemned the first sermon saw no objection to the doctrine thus enunciated.'

People, who have heard from time to time of his saintly life, and how his later years were soothed by the tender respect of opponents who, like himself, were growing older, and more disposed to forget and to forgive, would expect to find that patience in suffering and the suppression of all high-spiritedness in self-defence was his characteristic grace; but we are not sure that they would credit him with courage in attack. 'Poor dear Dr. Pusey,' is the frame in which many a man has set the mild, ascetic, dull countenance of a learned patriarch, living out of the world, without brilliancy, unredeemed by wit, too good to be angry, too retired to be formidable, unlikely to trouble the peace of any voluptuary who would take care to avoid his holy presence, without the fierceness which made Elijah thrust himself across the path of Ahab. But such kind of folk mistake the man. While prelates thought he was stimulating a morbid taste among feeble women for a scrupulosity of conscience, and some said of him, 'Nay, but he deceiveth the people,' he, with the lordly spirit of Chrysostom, bishop of a great city in the fifth century, would go into the heart of fashionable London and thunder against the broad vices and secret corruptions of the clubs and drawing-rooms. A satirist might say the same things without wincing, enjoying the sting he gave, or a preacher with scant brains and a taste for sensationalism might make the impetuosity of rhetoric do duty for righteous indignation—such bold men in the pulpit are not hard to find. But knowing from what kind of life Dr. Pusey emerged, and who he was, when he stood in Mr. Liddell's pulpit in Belgravia, and preached on 'Our Pharisaism' in 1868, or in All Saints, Margaret Street, on 'Why did Dives lose his soul?' in 1865, we feel that what gave his voice its unwonted liberty was no intellectual pleasure in saying strong things, but simply the spirit of Elijah, and Daniel, and John the Baptist, that drove him to this extremity. Alfred Bowen Evans was, for invective and satire, one of the most remarkable preachers of his day. He was bold and solemn, and could be awful; but whether he lashed the sins, or unripped the hypocrisies, or reduced the pleasantries and plausibilities of half-hearted religionists to absurdity, you were aware of his cleverness, you saw his own satisfaction; he would make you laugh at his humour, smile at the real beauty of his sur-

prises of poetical thought and pure diction, marvel at his impudence, stare at his thunder; but you never forgot the voice in the word. How different and incomparably greater was Dr. Pusey! We will undertake to say that no gentleman or lady in S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, on that Ash Wednesday, 1868, thought it anything but serious earnest, when flash after flash came forth from that pale face, and the quiet cadence of that loving voice fell in mighty thunderings. They had not a breath to waste on the man. It was all they could do to breathe through the storm of words he spoke:—

‘What are fathers, brothers, mothers doing, that we can hear of an undress as if we were still in Paradise; of the bareness of dress of savage life, unredeemed by savage simplicity; of persons, as it were, exposed to view as though the drawing-rooms of our nobility were slave-markets in which the young, in the full freshness of opening life, are set for sale to the highest bidder, a coronet or a millionaire (no matter of what character), and so it is thought fair and right that the purchaser should see what he buys, and make his choice amid the competing wares? There is worse behind. But I forbear. . . . Yet of this I may speak as notorious, that through this prevailing barbaric love of finery and pomp our young men betake themselves to relations unhallowed by marriage, against the law of God, because they cannot support the sinful extravagance to be hallowed forsooth by marriage. . . . What is this gorgeous, selfish, pitiless array but an earnest and image of the robes of eternal flame? But of all the Pharisaisms of the day our church-going seems to me the masterpiece. Do we believe what we say? How then is our belief not our condemnation? Is union with God a selfish thing? Is it nothing to us that our brethren starve spiritually while we keep to ourselves the bread of life, and here or there only in this wide-waste wilderness of human souls one is found to cry out, “Let him that is athirst come and take of the water of life freely”? Whither are these three millions of human beings going? To the judgment-seat of Christ. But what afterwards? I own I hope more for the degraded poor than for the self-satisfied rich. At least they are not Pharisees. God grant that even in their last hour they may be as the publican! But what do we to this end? A certain number of missions here and there (and these sometimes persecuted), a few Scripture-readers or Bible-women—are these our worthy efforts to recover from Satan’s jaws the sheep of Christ, and show how we prize the Precious Blood by which we boast that we know more than others that we have been redeemed? What but this atmosphere of Pharisaism with which we are encompassed, this yellow fog, mingled of all the faults of Pharisaism, Sadduceeism, Herodianism, which chokes our breathing and obstructs our sight, could make us take up with such a zealless, loveless, lifeless worship of God, Who is Love, as this?’

Few of those who have talked of Dr. Pusey as if they

knew him would credit him with the irony which like a biting acid tinges the pages of his sermon on Dives :—

‘One only sin has been thought to be hinted at in that especial punishment of the tongue, the favourite sin of our Christian world—backbiting. Perhaps he had not refinement enough for a new sin, which I hear of in our fastidious times, “ambiguous words.” . . . He made “good cheer,” and that “splendidly,” “magnificently” (so the words mean). There is not one word about excess, about having persons at his table notorious for their immorality (gallantry, the world calls it). He kept a well-appointed table, and was known for the magnificence of his entertainments. Had he lived in these days, the world would have been told the next morning : “Dives gave a splendid entertainment at his elegant mansion in such a square, and among the distinguished company were such and such of the fashionable world.” And some of the younger of you perhaps would have wished that they had been there ; and mothers would have bethought themselves how they could obtain tickets for Lady Dives’ next assembly. . . . Perhaps in these days we should, some of us, have read at our breakfast-table the next morning, “We regret to announce that Dives was taken ill in the midst of a splendid and select circle, remained insensible, and died at an early hour this morning. . . .” And people would have said a word or two of the sudden death of Dives, or moralized a little on the instability of human things. I doubt whether any now would have spoken of him as “*poor* Dives.” One thing alone people would have shut their eyes to—“Where is he now?” Our Lord lifts the veil and tells us—“in torments,” “tormented in this flame.” Alas, Dives ! who would be of thy party now ? . . . But look again in detail. What grace is there room for in this life of frivolity, of self-indulgence, of sense, of self ? I must not, I suppose, name repentance. It has a harsh, austere sound in delicate ears. David says of himself, “Every night make I my bed to swim ; and I water my couch with my tears.” What a penitence ! It would spoil the eyes, and ruin all one’s looks. . . . *They* have no need of repentance. *They* have never committed in their youth sins which the thought of God brings to their mind. Truly, I believe that the thought of God does not bring their sins to their mind ; for they never think of Him, if they can help it, except that His providence somehow has made over to them a portion of His possessions on this earth, for which, since it came to them in the way of nature or of lawful industry, they need not thank Him.’

After noticing the ‘charity blankets’ advertised in a few shop windows, and in another window in Oxford Street a lady’s dress ‘that would furnish a meal to 7,000 poor,’ the sermon contains a magnificent passage on charity being, as well as purity, an absolute command of God. And then, like an ebbing wave, it sweeps to the very ground of the foul sins of heartless selfishness which starve and murder souls.

he ne
we kn
shrin
know
as ou
it is s
cloth
who f
toil.
by oc
you w
where
may s
ment
ceive
most
of eve
ever ?

W
Pusey
a str
sider
the li
High
the fa
minut
psych
so ea
subje
the ol
and b
or any
round
morb
and c
if thos
object
With
ing o
None,
can s
spring
of Jesu
‘O
because

'Dives had this excuse, that it was not an extreme necessity which he neglected. Lazarus was fed by others: yet Dives is in hell. But we know of Lazarus starving, and *not* fed; kept out of our sight, often shrinking from it; his cries unheard by us, but heard of God. We know of chronic distress among our artisans, men of the same blood as ourselves, against whom famine tries habitually its strength, so that it is said that "nothing can starve them." The weavers of your gay clothing starve, while you make a show of their toil. The women who fit your dresses perish untimely (some hard by) by their wasting toil. It is a known class of women which ekes out its scanty wages by occasional deadly, degrading sin. . . . And you, which robe are you weaving for yourselves? Are you arraying Christ in the robes wherewith you clothe His poor, that at the awful day your Judge may say, "With this have ye clad Me: I see you, not in the defilement of your sins, but clothed in the robe of My righteousness; receive the robe of glory, which I have dyed for you with My Own most Precious Blood." If not, what remains for you but the robe of everlasting fire, to wreath round you, your inseparable dress for ever?'

What would be rhetoric in most men is doctrine in Dr. Pusey, and what may look like morbidness is in him life after a strict rule of health. It is of a piece with his stern *consideration* of the Judgment Day, as Christ bids us 'consider the lilies of the field,' and S. Paul 'consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Jesus Christ,' that he looks in the face of sin so steadily, daring to scrutinize, dissect, report minutely. And all this without that curious appetite for psychology, which infects some spiritual entomologists with so earthly a taint, even when their hand is laid on a holy subject. Dr. Pusey is forearmed by the preventive sense of the objectivity of religion. His is an objective Christianity; and be it judgment, punishment, sin, repentance, forgiveness, or anything else, he starts from a dogmatic basis, and works round a dogmatic centre. People fondly warn us of being morbid, deprecate medicine, prefer food, counsel manliness, and caution us against scrupulousness and effeminacy. But if those, who forewarn, would forearm us with the teaching of objective truth, there would be less need of their monitions. With Dr. Pusey all that may be said of his prophetic teaching of the Divine judgment is true of the Divine love. None, who thinks less often and less profoundly of the Judge, can safely speak of God's love as richly as he; and the spring of all his fear and all his love is the *fact* of God and of Jesus Christ.

'O my Jesus, how long shall it be that men shall love Thee less because Thou deservest so infinitely to be loved; that Thy love shall

not be believed, because its greatness is so inconceivable? Oh, if we could, but for one moment, see with S. Stephen heaven opened, what should we behold, adored by Cherubim and Seraphim, the Joy of all the heavenly intelligences, the Mystery above all mysteries, on which they ever gaze, in which they behold the Divine love more and more unfolded to them, as they long to look into it—what but that Sacred Form of Jesus, irradiating heaven with the glory of the indwelling Godhead? . . . Oh, why is earth so different from heaven? Why have we disputing, instead of adoring; questioning, instead of thanksgiving; coldness, instead of the fire of love? It is because men live so much in the things of time and sense, and think so little of Him who never forgetteth us. Oh, *sursum corda! sursum corda!* One earnest, steadfast, piercing, longing, loving gaze into heaven will reveal to thee more than all this world's disputings; nay, than any argument; for "flesh and blood will not reveal" it unto thee, but "thy Father which is in heaven." Blessed will it be beyond all bliss, blessedness above all created joy, for it is the fruit of the infinite love of Jesus, the foretaste of the eternal joy of thy Lord, when with God-given faith thou canst say, I love Thee, O only salvation of my soul; for Thou hast redeemed me by Thy Blood, my Lord and my God. Thou, me!

We have referred above to the impression made on some minds outside Dr. Pusey's circle as to the unhealthy tone of his influence on those within that circle. What was in our minds was not so much the practical result of his 'direction' as the effect of his adapted books of devotion. We live very fast, and many who honestly value Dr. Pusey's work had probably forgotten, until they read Bishop Wilberforce's Life, that a series of such books had ever created a suspicion, or had ever seen the light; while others needed not the stimulant of a controversial biography to revive their interest in the fact, that Dr. Pusey deliberately thought the publication of such books conducive to the healthy condition of Christian men and women in the English Church. If it be not contemptuous to say so, the question has settled itself—'solvitur ambulando.' The books have gone the way which books that people get tired of do go. Men, who refuse to give up their liberty at the dictation of 'phobists' of any denomination, will still continue to use the *Paradisus Animæ Christianæ*, such parts as they approve, and think five-sevenths of the book as admirably Evangelical as any book of prayers they know; and probably, if they have taste, they will prefer the original Latin to a poor translation. It is also more than likely that such a book as the *Spiritual Combat*, on which S. Francis de Sales relied, will always retain its hold on Catholic minds. But the question in the main is this: Did Dr. Pusey's series

of
and
Yea
who
put
lica
grou
irrit
saili
grou
brin
was
adve
Had
un-E
it m
indie
Italy
have
disli
Fabi
call
restr
posit
Oxfo
belie
beca
taken
itera
fact
of C.
is pr
crime
seen
Quac
Table
maste
Ther
good
Bisho
with
curate
officia
'Peli
indisp

of adapted books suit the genius of the English Church, and tend to create that tone which the preface to the *Christian Year* asserts to be its characteristic? Bishop Wilberforce, who had special reasons for being sensitive on the point, put his finger on the 'Romanizing tendencies' of these publications. He professed to object to them on theological grounds; and his letters, kindly as they are, bristle with irritating suspicions that the Canon of Christ Church is sailing too near the wind. Dr. Pusey took the most tangible ground of defence he could, and challenged the Bishop to bring his attack to a point, and prove his unorthodoxy. It was bad policy of the Bishop to lend this advantage to his adversary, and to assail a theology which was defensible. Had he omitted the question of doctrine, and insisted on the un-English, heated, exaggerated tone of the books, and made it more a matter of climate and temperature than of creed, indicating that in England the style was an exotic, while in Italy and Spain it was a kindly fruit of the earth, he would have appealed to the common sense and taste of people who disliked Avrillon and liked Bishop Wilson, who thought Faber morbid and Keble healthy. But when he says 'My call is to action,' and struck almost before he spoke, and restrained a man of Dr. Pusey's incomparable character and position from all public ministrations in the Diocese of Oxford, 'except at Pusey in Berks, if he should be there, believing that there his ministry would be innocent,' the case became a painful one; and the lapse of thirty years has not taken away the sting. Dr. Pusey's defence against the reiterated charge of misdirection is conclusive. Unless the fact of A. B. having been the last person seen in the company of C. D., before the latter takes himself off to commit a felony, is presumptive evidence of the former's implication in the crime, the fact of a lady or young gentleman having been seen coming out of a house in the south-west corner of 'Tom Quad,' and then some time after being advertised in the *Tablet* as a convert, does not give colourable proof that the master of that house directed those persons towards Rome. Then, as to the books, while the editor puts on paper a very good defence, as may be seen in twenty pages of his letter to Bishop Blomfield in 1851, it may be frankly contended that with Bishop Wilberforce's English temperament, and inaccurate and not profound theology, and personal as well as official aptitude for 'action,' they were not at all likely to suit: '*Pelidæ stomachum cedere nescii*;' and that in the main his indisposition towards them was right. Yet, again, on a calm

review of that controversy after more than thirty years, when both those valuable lives have passed, leaving each in its own line a track of light behind, can we escape the conviction that it was an *impar congressus*? This episode in the great epic is an illustration of the undeniable truth which history will affirm, and which even at this day may be told without passion and heard without wounded pride: that trouble of necessity there must be, and confusion, and pain, where those in authority have to form a judgment on the wisdom of men who are their superiors in knowledge, and to take action against men who are their superiors in character. Decorum and courtesy may recommend a postponement of criticism for a while, but the natural herb will vindicate its right to grow at will round the graves of the titled and untitled dead; and when the reviewer of recent events has given way to the historian, the history of the Oxford movement will cast full light upon the relations of English Bishops to the English Church; and the poet, who knows nothing of the semblances of official life, will fix the character of the man, be he prelate or priest. Comparing man for man, as even now we have the opportunity of comparison, we can only marvel at the patience and submissiveness of Dr. Pusey and his comrades, and the sweetness with which he ventured to suggest that there was a nobler career for rulers who had mind and heart to take it than prohibitions, and that the Church of England might profit by experience of the past:—

‘A more generous course,’ he writes in 1839 to Bishop Bagot, and repeats the same in 1851 to Bishop Blomfield, ‘a more generous course, which would have interposed when necessary the *guidance*¹ of authority, and *led* but not inhibited, might have made Wesley and Whitfield useful members of the Church, instead of leaving them to plunge thousands into schism, and to train off into a delusive doctrine many of the best members of our Church.’

We are aware that a very different view of the functions of a Bishop is taken by many who have just claims on our attention. Lord Houghton has his view, which is almost out of date; but from quite another quarter comes this eulogy on the Bishops, that ‘the moderation of the episcopal bench has for the present averted any such calamity’ as ‘an ever-widening gulf between the clergy and the laity.’ It is ‘moderation,’ then, which is the signature of a man’s fitness to be a ruler of the Church! If by this term be meant an assemblage of those qualities which enable a man to be a

¹ The Italics are ours.

moder
cussion
cision
truth,
the be
man i
ruling
great
of the
subject
with th
the his
Bishop
intemp
he had
his po
proves
two d
bench
compe

Th
the la
tion
pass
For in
only c
bishop
presen
for de
manly
in wh
few of
the lif
compa
though
This i

M
author
Libera
might
the ra
that I
presen
plosiv
of ma

moderator—competent knowledge of the subject under discussion, intelligence to understand what is said, mental precision to appreciate the points, a noble love of the highest truth, absolute justice, and temper sure to commend itself to the best-tempered and equal to command the worst-tempered man in the crowd—then moderation is a just criterion of ruling power. The early Charges of Bishop Thirlwall have a great deal of this power, and only want a deeper knowledge of the truth, more original study and less ‘getting up’ the subject, more experimental and less critical acquaintance with the doctrine, to make them valuable commentaries on the history of thought in the English Church forty years ago. Bishop Phillpotts was not distinguished for moderation, being intemperate and with too much of the heat of a partisan; but he had wonderful ability in thinking through a subject, and his power of statement and expression in theological writing proves that he was a theologian thrown away. Besides these two distinguished prelates there was no one on the same bench before whom the Oxford theologians could get a competent hearing.

The paper in *Macmillan's Magazine* of October, in which the late Archbishop of Canterbury commends the ‘moderation’ of his brethren, suggests many lines of inquiry which pass straight into the central interests of Dr. Pusey's life. For instance, in kindly and dispassionate tones, as if he spoke only of what he saw in the dry light of cold reason, the Archbishop makes Dr. Pusey and his friends responsible for the present scepticism and secularity of the University of Oxford; for deterring from holy orders students of an independent, manly type ‘by the somewhat eccentric, over-priestly guise in which the Oxford theology of to-day has enveloped not a few of its votaries;’ and for a lamentable failure to influence the life of the English people in the direction of Christianity compared with the far greater achievements of Dr. Arnold, though his activity lasted so short a time and closed in 1842. This is a severe indictment, and worth examining.

Mr. Newman himself foretold that the prohibition, by authority, of the Catholic revival would induce a flood of Liberalism in Oxford; and minds of inferior sagacity to his might have foreseen as much. Dr. Pusey's investigation of the rationalistic character of the theology of Germany proved that he was not living in a fool's paradise unaware of the presence of the foe without. There was ‘in the air’ an explosive element of thought which had shattered the traditions of many generations of Englishmen; and after the revolution

of domestic politics which began in 1828, 1829, and 1832, it was absolutely certain that the spirit of free inquiry would challenge other assumptions and privileges. A people who had begun to assert the sovereignty, not of prescription, but of principle, were not likely to be more scrupulous in handling the Church of Lord Eldon than his State. If there were nothing more to show for the Church than the privileges of the Establishment, the best blood of English manhood was not likely to rise to its defence. But the Oxford men set themselves to explain to the mind of England what else there was to show for it; and so well has their work been done that men nowadays know what the Church is, and that it is worth living in and dying for; and those who long to preserve the Establishment know what is in the earthly vessel; and those who care less for it are not afraid of disestablishment, because they know that the heavenly treasure still remains. The best intellect and highest character in Oxford responded generously to the sublime attractions set before them; and if, as the highest authority vouches for the fact, 'the men who go forth yearly from our universities to be the curates of the English Church are at least as well equipped for their holy and difficult work' as they were forty years ago, the devotion of such men is a symptom of the impulse of the Catholic revival and the force of the Oxford school. The highest characters which enter the ministry of the English Church to-day would not be attracted by anything less than the divine supernatural aspect of the life. They aspire to a level above world-bettering, to a devotion above mediocrity, to a society above a rank of privileged persons to whom the rule of subdividing labour has happened to assign the beneficent, or literary, or militant duties of the kingdom of Christ. They believe that a divine body lives on the earth now, and that the work for which they offer themselves is needful to the perfect life of that body. This is the attraction which now, as before, touches the nobler spirits; and no one of fair candour will deny that the magnet has been held in no stronger hands before the hearts of this generation than by Dr. Pusey and his colleagues.

Was it an imposture? Was it the glamour and witchery of one magical genius? If it was, something might be said of his responsibility for the dissolving view. If it were a theory or excitement, or game or sentiment, created for a purpose, if there were no idea in it which could satisfy the reasonable mind, or if exaggeration were designedly employed to heighten the fascination of the novelty produced, then the authors might

be just
ference
Oxford
1842 s
'as a
might
receive
the do
than a
an op
Church
constit
both o
reactio
found
Bishop
these
justific
commu
ablene
it. E
employ
rigorous
If
independ
of Bis
form o
respon
cases
pressu
place,
tender
nobles
It is a
and re
finely
William
of bein
so. T
genero
breath
older m
another
was b
was ac

be justly charged with criminous recklessness and stupid indifference to the results of a reaction. But the work of the Oxford School was nothing of the sort. Bishop Thirlwall in 1842 speaks of the controversial writing to which it gave birth, 'as a precious addition to our theological literature, such as might perhaps suffer little by comparison with all that it had received in the course of a century before.' He denies that the doctrine was 'a novelty:' 'at the bottom it is nothing more than a revival.' 'It is not only an indisputable fact that such an opposition or divergency always has existed within the Church, but it seems likewise to be a necessary result of her constitution and character.' 'We are led by the language both of its friends and its adversaries to consider it as a reaction, an attempt to counteract a religious system which it found existing and gaining ground within the Church.' The Bishop of St David's proceeds to examine the teaching of these writers on certain cardinal points of controversy—justification, tradition, apostolical succession, and reserve in communicating religious knowledge; and vindicates its reasonableness and purity from the intemperate assaults made upon it. Even the language of Tract XC., and that too freely employed against the Reformation, while he submits it to rigorous criticism, he discusses with no hostility or contempt.

If then the Catholic Revival so far commended itself to an independent witness of the judicial power and 'moderation' of Bishop Thirlwall, it needs more than an innuendo in the form of an interrogation to fasten on the great Tractarians responsibility for present unbelief. There may be individual cases where the tension was so aggravated by the excessive pressure of one strong mind on another, that a fracture took place, and the rebound was disastrous. The Archbishop tenderly alludes to Arthur Clough, one of the profoundest and noblest natures that Oxford in its best days ever sheltered. It is a grave and sad fact, known to some of his contemporaries, and resented by not a few, that the strain put upon Clough's finely organized intellect and deep heart by his elder friend William George Ward was shattering and destructive, instead of being, what Ward meant it to be, constructive. It may be so. To some minds Ward was a dangerous master; and when generous and liberal friends of Clough speak under their breath with indignation of the unscrupulous hardihood of the older man, they are to be heard with sympathy. But there is another aspect of the case. Mr. Ward was asked by one who was beginning to observe Clough with interest, whether he was addicted to Newman and his school. 'No,' said Ward

promptly and cheerfully. 'No ; and surely it is better as it is. Considering how lately Clough has come from Dr. Arnold's influence, no one could wish him to plunge into Newman.' The fact is, as regards Ward, that his way of talking and teaching varied with his companion. If he were one with real capacity and a disputant able to hold his own, his force and freedom of speech was prodigious ; he would break through any crust of tradition, revel in revolutionary paradoxes, reason with extraordinary rapidity, and stop with startling abruptness on the brink of a shocking dilemma. Or if a young man were forward and clever enough to assume equality, he would take him at his word and declaim with scant reserve. On the other hand, if he were conversing with an elder and superior, or, as he would report himself, sitting at his feet and listening, he would be receptive not argumentative ; and if he had by his side a pupil who came to learn, he would be the gentlest and most considerate, while he was the most suggestive and original, of teachers. Neither Mr. Newman and his colleagues nor their ablest lieutenants, of whom Mr. Ward was perhaps the most remarkable, can be held responsible for the antecedents of the young men who came to Oxford from the four quarters of the world ; certainly they are not answerable for Dr. Arnold's previous influence on his illustrious pupils. The final impression left on the reader by Archbishop Tait's kindly remarks on Mozley's *Reminiscences* is, that Dr. Arnold is the great apostle of Christianity to the educated laymen of our age, and that if he had not been so hindered by the Tractarians, and his work been so soon cut short by death, Oxford at least, if not England, would be in a healthier and happier condition of belief. Does it ever occur to those who do not fear to identify an antecedent with a cause and a sequel with a consequence, that an inquiry into the histories of Dr. Arnold's famous pupils subsequent to their Oxford days would suggest grave reflections, and result in some startling and sad conclusions ? It may be doubted whether any group of men issuing from one pupil-room has ever exhibited more unsettledness of mind. This is the mildest form in which the fact can be stated. Flagrant cases will occur to any one tolerably conversant with modern lines of thought which would justify far stronger language. The character of Dr. Arnold is the possession of England ; and all men are poorer for the depreciation of the character of our public men ; but when a challenge has been given to say why Dr. Arnold's representation of the Christian life is not the best which this age of Englishmen has seen, the truth must be told at any risk of giving pain. Dr. Arnold by

what
to e
scan
one
up h
a th
This
cont
Trac
happ
chur
mal
C
vidua
is a
of P
have
was
intell
crash
work
field
teach
estim
Arno
his st
grou
reach
'P
hard
comp
better
will r
with v
him.
go, aw
you a
and w
It
be sai
advan
any
friend
gelica
chara
vor

what he taught, as well as by what he omitted to teach, failed to erect a bulwark against unbelief, and gave his scholars scant support against the divers trials of their faith. Where one man is now leading a life of energetic holiness, who traces up his best endeavours, under God, to Dr. Arnold's teaching, a thousand bless the names of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman. This is not a comparison of persons, but of systems; and our contention is, that the system substantially taught by the Tractarians is living on in the work and character of hopeful, happy, and triumphant Christians in hundreds of parish churches and thousands of homes in England, in spite of the malaria of unbelief.

Or, again, let it be allowed that the system and the individual act mutually on one another, and that personal influence is a divine means for propagating the truth; then the names of Pusey, Newman, and Keble will bear any scrutiny. We have heard it asserted by no mean authority that Newman was a great master of 'sentiment,' and that he wasted large intellectual powers on fabricating a theory, which at last crashed like rotten ice as soon as he paused upon it; that his work for God was nothing in comparison with Bishop Blomfield's church-building in Bethnal Green, and with Arnold's teaching which he decried. Our readers will smile at such an estimate of the men. It was rumoured about 1841, that Arnold thought of making Oxford his head-quarters, and with his staff around him doing battle with Newman on his own ground. Ward, who knew them both, said, when the rumour reached him :—

'I know well what the end will be *if* Arnold tries it. He will hit hard and make it known what he means; but will utterly fail to comprehend what Newman means. Newman will put Arnold's views better than he will put them himself, and then demolish them. He will run round him before he knows where he is. You go to Newman with what you think a fresh difficulty and hesitatingly put it before him. You find he has foreseen it and has an answer ready, and you go away with boundless confidence in his capacity to understand you and in his sympathy to feel with you. Arnold has none of this, and would soon find himself nowhere.'

It is difficult to tabulate a great man's work; but it may be said for Newman that single-handed he has done more to advance the power of preaching in the English Church than any score of able men; that he in association with his friends (reserving due and well-merited honour for the 'Evangelical' school which preceded them in this work) raised the character and life of the English clergy to a high level, from

which they will have a commanding influence in the land, though all the accidents of their position be swept away ; that they created Sisterhoods which, more than any form of religious activity, has proved that something beyond the old machinery of the parochial system is wanted in order to evangelize our cities ; that, although the foreign missions of the Church were not an immediate subject in their programme, yet they have indirectly given impulse and intensity to that special form of high devotion, and have been, and are, the least non-natural interpreters and the most straightforward witnesses, in the face of a luxurious, wealthy, and busy generation, to the evangelical commandments of fasting, almsgiving, and prayer.

We have spoken of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman together. It is inevitable, a necessity altogether happy, which makes for the honour of humanity, and is of the essence of the brotherhood of noble minds. A reviewer in the *Quarterly* has divided Dr. Pusey into two sections. Another may, by-and-by, divide Cardinal Newman into three or four, as ingenious politicians will bisect Mr. Gladstone ; but happily the man is one. This is the fate of all great men who live and grow. It never occurred to Dr. Pusey that his friend was not one, and we venture to say that to Cardinal Newman's clear great intellect and large true heart his ancient friend is, as in Another Sphere he will be, one. Indeed he points to the consistency of Dr. Pusey as one of his characteristics. In the *Apologia* he says of him :—

‘He was a man of large designs ; he had a hopeful, sanguine mind ; he had no fear of others ; he was haunted by no intellectual perplexities. People are apt to say that he was once nearer to the Catholic Church than he is now. I pray God that he may be one day far nearer to the Catholic Church than he was then, for I believe that in his reason and judgment all the time that I knew him he never was near to it at all.’

Again :—

‘If confidence in his position is (as it is) a first essential in the leader of a party, Dr. Pusey had it. The most remarkable instance of this was his statement in one of his subsequent defences of the movement, when too it had advanced a considerable way in the direction of Rome, that among its most hopeful peculiarities was its “stationariness.” He made it in good faith ; it was his subjective view of it.’

Why was he stationary ? Possibly because in him the play of intellect was less agile, his fancy less nimble, his imagination more dull ; and with these—defects, shall they

be c
min
occu
to s
seve
duti
whor
Noti
a de
man
serm
write
and
latio
lette
alrea
wha
serm
Puse
overs
to m
Hur
instan
share
Ward
jealou
Mozle
Mr. M
tual a
under
was s
study
to wh
rate e
we bel
which
Th
interp
Dr. Li
Englan
ness’
ness to
could
offende
the des

be called?—there was a tremendous law of gravitation determining to the conscience. The largest space in his mind was occupied by practical religion; and when he devoted the rest to study of Holy Scripture and patristic theology, it was as severely consecrated ground as the wide field of his personal duties to man and God. Hence the impression, which the whole man leaves on us, of the sovereignty of conscience. Nothing is further from our thought than an invidious use of a degree of comparison; but Dr. Pusey is the most *religious* man this generation has seen. He will therefore live in his sermons. His dogmatic teaching will be re-cast by better writers. The scholar and artist will work upon his material and produce it in a finer form. But his sermons defy translation, and the spirit will do more for the immortality of the letter than art. May the 'Life,' for which the Church is already longing, worthily illustrate by external evidence what by internal evidence we already know through the sermons—the nature of the man! This religiousness of Dr. Pusey, and ascendancy of conscience over intellect till it overshadowed it, may be the reason why he was less attractive to men of a certain temperament than Newman, or Keble, or Hurrell Froude. There is no evidence that Ward, for instance, occupied his thoughts very much with Dr. Pusey's share of the work. He did not interest an intellect like Ward's. So also his friends were recently affronted, in their jealous gratitude, by the position assigned to him by Mr. Mozley in his *Reminiscences*. The cause is not far to seek. Mr. Mozley was attracted to the Movement, not first by spiritual affinities, but by the fact—which his plain, robust, clever understanding promptly recognized—that the Oxford Revival was simply the best thing in the age, and most worth the study of a reasonable and serious mind. And in this temper, to which his personal attachment to Newman gave a moderate enthusiasm, he threw in his lot with the Tractarians. This we believe to be a rational and equitable account of the matter, which the author himself would, without offence, accept.

The same characteristic of Dr. Pusey gives the key for the interpretation of his action at that crisis of his life when, as Dr. Liddon lately said, he held the fortunes of the Church of England in his hand. Let others account for his 'stationariness' at that moment as they may; let them impute obtuseness to his intellect so that he could not see a conclusion nor could be convinced. We do not allow this, but are not offended. It was not prejudice, nor stubbornness, much less the despicable intention to be, materially at least, consistent,

that kept him here, while others went away ; but obedience to God, as he had ever lived by it, was now the supreme and absorbing thought in his mind. He might have been the unlettered man in the Gospel, who knew one fact and that was enough. Logicians were around him, proving to him incontestably that he could not believe this, and must believe that ; but, like the simple religious man that he was, he retired on the one fact—'one thing I know.' A more massive mind and a more acute reasoner, James Mozley, who, by reason of the difference of age, stood at another angle, received a shock from the action of his leader in 1845 from which he never recovered—at least, so far as to regain his original position ; but the equal, whose feet were on the same platform, felt every vibration when the balance was disturbed, and yet preserved his equilibrium, and in that pathetic hour was heard to say with unbroken voice in his natural tone of honourable sympathy, 'Newman was like a sharp sword eating its way out of its scabbard. His sensitive nature could no longer bear the evil that was around him.' In the same temper he lived on for nearly thirty years, abating nothing of his laborious industry, detracting nothing from his ancient sympathies, the most religious teacher of his age ; and if he was rich in hope, it was because he had the accumulated wealth of a life of prayer. For

'prayer is possession. Faithful prayer is sure possession of all that the redeemed will of man can desire from the will of God into the unity and harmony of which it is redeemed by Christ. The man who is full of prayer is full of power. I would rather have the gift of a brother's faithful prayers than of his plentiful substance. And I feel that when I have given to a brother my faithful prayers, I have given him my best and greatest gift.'¹

ART. VII.—MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED- WIFE'S SISTER UNLAWFUL.

The Relationships which bar Marriages considered Scripturally, Socially, and Historically. (Edinburgh, 1871.)

Opinions of the Hebrew and Greek Professors of the European Universities on the Scriptural Aspect of the Question regarding the Legalization of Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. (London, 1882.)

¹ Irving's *Sermons*.

Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—a Village Talk. By THOMAS VINCENT, M.A., Rector of Pusey. (London, 1882.)

On Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. By the Bishop (WORDSWORTH) of Lincoln. (London, 1876.)

Charge Delivered by the Bishop of Lincoln at his Triennial Visitation, 1882.

Speech of the Bishop (TEMPLE) of Exeter at his Diocesan Conference on the Subject of Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister, 1882.

Reasons for Legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. By LORD DENMAN. (London, 1880.)

WHEN our Blessed Lord was upon earth He entirely disclaimed all political functions, all legislative functions, and all judicial or magisterial functions, which bore on them the impress of a limited or national character. As His Father's Minister, indeed, He held a commission having reference 'to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' and to no others. But, so far as Royalty went, His kingdom was 'not of this world,' and it formed no part of His duty to deliver the nation of Israel from subjection to Rome. It belonged not to Him as a legislator to lay down any rules about Jewish rights of inheritance or the intricacies of Hebrew property law. It was not for Him as a judge to apply the law of Moses, even in one of its clearest enactments, to the condemnation of a convicted adulteress. These matters lay outside of His province. Yet all the while He was and professed to be a King¹: a King bearing witness to, and having witness borne to Him by, eternal truth; a King claiming (what no earthly ruler can claim) lordship over the inner hearts and consciences of men. He was a lawgiver, imposing on the world, 'as one that had authority and not as the Scribes,' such statutes as they of old time had not imagined, and as the world in its rolling ages since has but very slowly learned to practise, or even to admire. In His hands judgment is placed; yea, the Father hath committed *all* judgment throughout the whole created universe unto the Son. The Lord Jesus, then, is universal King, universal Lawgiver, and universal Judge. He is not, He never would consent to be, a national king, a national lawgiver, or a national judge.

It would seem to follow from the above considerations that any subject, on which the law has been laid down by

¹ See Dr. Westcott, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, on S. John xviii. 37: 'Truth, absolute reality, is the realm of Christ.'

Christ or His Apostles, is lifted thereby (to the extent to which law has been so laid down) out of the sphere of merely national obedience, binding on this or that country, into the higher position of moral and universal duty to which all persons, and all states, and all societies, are bound implicitly to submit.

Now, this was distinctly the case with Holy Matrimony: an institution founded in its purest form by God Himself in Eden, but corrupted, and subjected to various irregularities at which law had connived, as time went on. Our Lord re-enacted the original law in all its fulness. Putting aside altogether such relaxations as had been condoned on account of the hardness of Jewish hearts in the matters of polygamy and divorce, He went back to the beginning when 'God made them male and female and said,' 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and the twain (*Revised Version*) shall become one flesh. So that they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.'

It is remarkable that in this re-enactment of the law our Saviour inserts the word *twain*, which is found in the *Septuagint* and the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, but which had either never found a place in, or had been suffered to drop out from, the Hebrew text; and the word is one of distinct emphasis as implying a prohibition of polygamy. This teaching of Jesus Christ is repeated by S. Paul in his Epistle to the *Ephesians* (v. 31), and is further illustrated by reference to the close union subsisting between Christ Himself and the Church, and by the statement, 'This is a great mystery.' What is the great mystery? What else but the intense oneness of those united in the marriage state? 'For in heathen, and to some extent in Jewish, thought, marriage was a contract far less sacred than the indissoluble tie of blood; and wherever Christian principle is renounced or obscured, that ancient idea recurs in modern times.'¹ Then it is also worthy of note that, whereas with respect to some subjects, such as the Sabbath and the ceremonial directions of Moses, the method of the New Testament is to intensify the spirit of the old law in the very act of relaxing or even abrogating its letter, with holy matrimony the case is different. The letter in this case has special stress laid upon it. Two cases of incest are brought before us: the one the sin of Herod Antipas, the other that of the man who was guilty of 'such

¹ Bishop Ellicott's *New Testament Commentary for English Readers*, Dr. Barry *in loco*.

fornication as is not named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife;' and the guilt in both these cases is made to rest on relationship contracted by previous marriage, and on that alone. Arguments may be adduced, we know, in each of these instances to show that the former partner was living or was not living; and if the former were true, it has been said that there was sufficient matter for blame in the fact of the adultery. With that we are not careful to deal. Whether adultery were imputable or not in either case or in both, it is certain that in neither does the sacred writer draw attention to the adultery, but in both to the marriage relationship which made the subsequent unions *incestuous*.

Remembering now that in the story of the incestuous Corinthian the word used to describe his sin is the generic term *πορνεία*, let us turn to the Acts of the Apostles (xv. 20), and observe that precisely the same word is used to describe one of the things forbidden in the decree made by the Council of Jerusalem. The meaning of the word in that place is open to much discussion. Thus much, however, is certain, that the things condemned by the Council were from the nature of the case not such as were openly and manifestly unlawful, like fornication in its ordinary meaning, but things as to which Gentile converts might reasonably entertain a doubt. Among these might naturally be included marriage within such degrees of relationship as had been permitted by the old Roman law, but were forbidden in the code which Christians felt bound to accept. Now, it is plain matter of fact that all kinds of incest forbidden, directly or by implication, in the Old Testament, were forbidden also by the heathen law of Rome, with certain rare exceptions.¹ Those exceptions were marriage with the deceased brother's wife, marriage with the deceased wife's sister (which we will for the moment only assume to be forbidden in the Old Testament), and marriage with the niece. To this last, moreover, public attention had very recently been drawn by the senatorial decree which permitted the marriage of the Emperor Claudius with his niece Agrippina. For until that decree was passed the Roman law had, in respect of this particular union, agreed with the Jewish law; and we know that public feeling at Rome had been severely shocked by the newly legalized licence.

When, then, we consider the use of this term *πορνεία*,

¹ Pusey's *God's Prohibition of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister*, pp. 18, 19.

applied alike to one prohibition of the Council and to the Corinthian's sin, and also the historical fact above described, bringing the subject of prohibited degrees to the fore, considerable probability seems to attach to the suggestion that one object aimed at in the Apostolic decree was the assimilation of Gentile practice on this particular subject to the law observed by Jewish Christians.

Indeed, what we have modestly described as a possible interpretation has been strongly urged and insisted on by Dr. McCaul,¹ perhaps the ablest of all the advocates for the relaxation of the law which forbids marriage with the sister of a deceased wife. He urges very forcibly that the four requirements of the Apostolic Council are four things required by Moses *of the Gentiles*. (For meats offered to idols, see Lev. xvii. 8, 9; for blood, xvii. 10-13; for things strangled, xvii. 15; for *πορνεία*, in the sense here suggested, xviii. 26.)

We confess that we are not ourselves disposed to press the matter so far. What we would lay stress on is simply this: that of the four requirements one and only one is essentially moral in its nature—viz. the abstinence from *πορνεία*; that this accordingly has been rightly regarded as of perpetual obligation on all Christians; and that, if it be, we will not say certain, but fairly conceivable, that this word has reference to marriage within prohibited degrees, to that extent the New Testament suggests a reference on this subject to an older law.

A solid reason beyond all question exists for the restrictions placed on human passion and caprice being more stringently insisted on under the new dispensation than had been the case before. Christ came as the great Preacher of a religion and Founder of a Church wherein was neither male nor female. The Gospel teaches the equality of the sexes, and declares that the subordination of the woman is only the subjection of perfect equality, a relationship of order, not an inferiority of position. Coincident with such teaching must necessarily be a total change in the social relations of the sexes and the freedom of intercourse between them. That freedom would bring with it new temptations, and might entail, if not carefully watched, new sins and new family troubles. It was reasonable, therefore, and a thing to be expected, that under such circumstances the great principle of marriage law should be restated, and the consequences

¹ Letter to Rev. W. H. Lyall, pp. 3, 4.

which flowed from it should be reconsidered and declared anew.

We have arrived, then, at this point in our argument: that any legislation inaugurated or confirmed in express terms by our Lord during His earthly ministry acquires thereby a moral and universal character, as distinguished from all ritual, ceremonial, or civil precepts which bore a transitory or national, and therefore limited, character; that our Lord did legislate very emphatically on the subject of marriage, reasserting the ancient but forgotten principle that a man and his wife are one flesh; that in the New Testament certain sins are denounced as incestuous, because they come under a ban which owes its entire existence to considerations of affinity or relationship by marriage; and that certain etymological and historical considerations suggest a probability that the *porneia* forbidden by the Council of Jerusalem might be the practice of marrying within degrees which were not prohibited under the Roman law, but which were prohibited under the law henceforth to be observed by Christians. What, then, was this law, and where is it to be found?

First, can such law be found in what has sometimes been called the *horror naturalis* which all nations are supposed to feel instinctively about certain abominable unions? We need not go so far as to dispute the existence of this *horror naturalis*; for the nations of Canaan had probably in fact, before the enactment of the Mosaic code, no other marriage law; and it is distinctly imputed as sin to them that they had defiled themselves by such unions as the Israelites were warned to avoid. But it is certainly very doubtful how far the mere instinct is to be trusted: it is probably a very variable feeling, depending much on education and preconceived ideas; and it was certainly in practice very grossly violated, not only by profane individuals, but by whole nations. The Egyptians allowed marriage with a full sister. The Medes and Persians were in the habit of marrying their mothers.¹ The Greeks and Romans, it is true, were stricter in these matters, though grave legislators like Solon and Lycurgus permitted marriage with half-sisters, the former with the father's daughter, the latter with the mother's.

Secondly, can we read a Christian law in some other kind of human instinct, such as that of reverence for elders in certain relationships, or in a consideration of the reasons for which Almighty God was pleased to implant in us any such

¹ See note on Lev. xviii. in *Speaker's Commentary*.

instincts? The reformer William Tyndale makes prohibition to depend on natural reverence. He seriously argues that it would be abomination for a man to marry his aunt,¹ because her state of conjugal subjection would conflict with the reverence which her husband owes to her as the sister of his father or his mother; but that there is no such objection to an uncle marrying his niece, because in this case conjugal authority and avuncular dignity, being both found in the same person, would only intensify, and not neutralize, one another. The same writer, taking upon himself to criticize the reason of God's law, decides that marriage between full brother and sister, though undesirable on other grounds, is less offensive than marriage between nephew and aunt; and so far as a half-sister is concerned, he says:—

'If greater peace and unity might be made with keeping her at home, I durst dispense with the law: as, if the king of England had a son by one wife, heir to England, and a daughter by another, heir to Wales, then, because of the great war that was ever wont to be between those countries, I would not fear to marry them together, for the making of a perpetual unity, and to make both countries one, for to avoid so great an effusion of blood.'

Surely the bare statement of these cases is sufficient to assure us that the Christian law of prohibited degrees ought to rest on some safer principle. Let us look for it.

At this point it seems not unnatural to ask whether it be conceivable, considering how intimately the relationship of the sexes to each other enters into the very web and fabric of all morality, that Almighty God should not have delivered very plain precepts on the subject. Such precepts we have, if we regard the Jewish code as of universal obligation: otherwise they are lacking altogether. Now, even if we were to give up the code of marriage law contained in the earlier verses of Lev. xviii. as a code binding on all nations; if we were to hold, as the Church of Rome does, that a power alike of adding to these prohibitions, and of dispensing with their observance, has been accorded to the Church; the fact would still remain that the Jewish code must be regarded as a highly authoritative inspired commentary on the Saviour's one eternal marriage law: that law, to wit, which was promulgated in Eden and re-enacted under the new dispensation—'The twain shall become one flesh;' and even so we should be driven to a very careful consideration of the code and of the principles which underlie it. But the case for that code's obligation

¹ *Expositions of Scripture*, published by Parker Society, p. 331.

is far stronger than this. The Bishop of Lincoln has pointed out in his recent Charge what has often been stated before (for, indeed, it is impossible to urge anything new on this subject), that the eighteenth chapter of the Book of Leviticus, from which our Table of forbidden degrees is 'derived—(either by express transcription or by logical inference)—is no part of the Levitical Law as such, but is a Marriage Code promulgated to all nations by God Himself, who exterminated the Canaanites (who knew nothing of the Levitical law) for violating that code.' How the nations of Canaan could know God's law before it had been promulgated in the form delivered to Israel, is a question on which we need not speculate. As we have hinted above, it was probably written only in their hearts; and such writing, we feel and assert, would be an insufficient guide to Christians now. But there is no irreverence in supposing that God, who assigns to everyone his proper proportion of revealed truth, may have made His voice in natural religion sound more clearly to those who had no other means of knowing, than He does to those who bask in the clearer light of a written revelation. However this may be, it is certain that Gentiles were held responsible for having broken these laws, and were punished accordingly. The laws must, therefore, on this ground, if on no other, be deemed laws of universal obligation.

When we come to interpret, it is important to insist on certain canons of interpretation. Such are these:

1. Interpret the code as a whole, regarding it as the exposition of a clear principle, allowing of no exceptions unless these are absolutely required by the plain grammatical meaning of its terms.
2. Admit the principle that not all prohibited degrees are stated, but that many are left to be inferred by parity of reasoning from those which do find expression in words.
3. Do not extend the principle of interpretation so as to make it involve prohibitions of a kind to which there is no parallel in the expressed precepts.

The first of these canons, requiring that the code should be taken as a whole, is surely to be held very fast. It is really extraordinary to observe how those who clamour for a relaxation of the law, throw on its supporters the onus of resting their whole case on a single text; that, moreover, being a text which the supporters themselves, so far as we are aware, never, or scarcely ever, adduce in this connexion. Let us explain our meaning a little more fully. The Earl of Dalhousie has taken great pains to elicit an expression of opinion from

the Hebrew and Greek professors of the European Universities on the Scriptural aspect of the question regarding the Legalization of Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. We might demur to the ingeniously narrow method of stating the case submitted to these learned authorities. The Hebrew professors are requested to limit their inquiry to the Mosaic writings, while their colleagues of the Greek professoriate are absolutely confined to one single text, *vis.* 'They two shall be one flesh' (Eph. v. 31), and are debarred by the form of question referred to them from taking into consideration any other passages found even within the limits of the New Testament. We should ourselves moreover have preferred the opinions of theologians to those of philologists on such a subject; but still we admit that a certain weight properly attaches to such evidence as his lordship has in fact elicited. When we come to examine the evidence we find that in the great mass of the replies no weight whatever is laid on the general drift of Lev. xviii.; but nearly all the arguments are made to hinge on verse 18, which is a difficult passage susceptible of many interpretations, and which, if interpreted in the way most favourable to the desired licence, would be no more than an exceptional inference deduced from a special prohibition. The words are, 'Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her lifetime.' Of this passage Professor Matthes, D.D., of Amsterdam, says it is the *locus classicus* on the subject. Professor Dillman of Berlin declares that 'The only passage in which the Mosaic law expresses itself on this subject is to be found in Leviticus xviii. 18.' Professor Isidor von Oculius of Czernovitz says, 'The passage referring to this subject (the italics are ours) occurs in Lev. xviii. 18,' as though there were no other. Professor König of Freiburg in Breisgau, Professor Segond of Geneva, Professor Merx of Heidelberg, with many others, speak in exactly the same way. Repeatedly the statement is made that Lev. xviii. 18 is the *only* passage bearing on the subject. In opposition to the conclusion of these learned men, there stands another bearing the honoured signature, 'E. B. Pusey;' and curiously enough the signatory in this case makes no allusion whatever to the particular verse on which so many declare the entire case to rest. He very properly takes, as we insist on taking, the Mosaic code as a whole, and refuses by emphatic silence to be drawn away from this consideration by one text of very doubtful meaning.

The second of our canons requires that logical inference

from
certa
state
of fa
man
mar
some
such
mar
and
there
fami
in J
equa
had
speak
wife
forbi
prin
relat
relat
den,
able
is no
gran
as it
wife.

C
whic
man
her
actu
of th
not
moth
tion
cann
that
exar
in i
reaso
I
now
ticus
Isra

from the prohibitions stated must be admitted as justifying certain other, but exactly parallel, prohibitions which are not stated. Thus, if a man may not marry his aunt, it is matter of fair inference that a woman may not marry her uncle; if a man may not marry his granddaughter, a woman may not marry her grandson, and the like. It has been urged by some writers in opposition to this that we are not justified in such inferences because, though a woman does become by marriage a member of her husband's family, taking its name and entering into it so as to be thoroughly incorporated therewith, a man does not so become a member of his wife's family. Whatever weight such an argument might have had in Jewish days, it can have none now that Christ has equalized the sexes. We would submit, however, that it never had weight at all. The stated list of prohibitions expressly speaks of a man as being related to his wife's mother, his wife's daughter, and his wife's granddaughter, and as being forbidden for that very reason to marry any of them. If the principle of the twain becoming one flesh brings him into relationship with any of his wife's kindred, it brings him into relationship with all. Moreover, if logical inference be forbidden, it is plain that some of the very grossest unions conceivable would be left open to the depraved conscience; for there is no direct prohibition to restrain a man from marrying his grandmother, or even his own daughter, if the latter be not, as it is conceivable she might not be, the daughter of his wife.

Our third canon guards us from a false interpretation which some would try to force upon us, in saying that if a man becomes a member of his wife's family and a woman of her husband's, the two families themselves must become actually one, and so no other marriages between any members of them could be allowable at all. Thus two brothers could not marry two sisters, and a father and son could not marry mother and daughter. The reasonable reply to this suggestion is, that a man by marriage fetters his own liberty, but cannot fetter the liberty of others. The Scriptural reply is that in all the cases given of nearness of kin, there is not one example of this suggested relationship, so that no argument in its favour can be drawn from analogy or parity of reasoning.

Having laid down our canons of interpretation, we would now proceed to interpret. The eighteenth chapter of Leviticus begins with a solemn appeal to the relation in which the Israelites stood to Almighty God, carrying with it an implica-

tion that what had been forbidden by the law of nature to Egyptians and Canaanites must be treated as doubly unlawful to them as the redeemed of Egypt, and the destined possessors by Divine right of Canaan.

'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, I am the Lord your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do : and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do : neither shall ye walk in their ordinances. Ye shall do My judgments, and keep Mine ordinances, to walk therein : I am the Lord your God. Ye shall therefore keep My statutes and My judgments ; which if a man do, he shall live in them : I am the Lord' (Lev. xviii. 1-6).

Then at the close of the chapter comes a very strong statement showing that neglect of and disobedience to the intervening ordinances by Gentile nations was regarded by Almighty God with the deepest abhorrence.

'Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things ; for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you, and the land is defiled ; therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants. Ye shall therefore keep My statutes and My judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations : neither any of your own nation, *nor any stranger that sojourneth among you* (for all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled) : that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, *as it spued out the nations that were before you*. For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people. Therefore shall ye keep Mine ordinance, that ye commit not any one of these abominable customs, which were committed before you, and that ye defile not yourselves therein : I am the Lord your God' (verse 24 *ad fin.*).

We have set these passages out at length, because of their overwhelming importance to our argument. They show, in the first place, the intensely moral character of the ordinances referred to ; and secondly, their specific and positive, as distinguished from their merely general, application to the whole of the Gentile world. Moreover, in this chapter the ordinances are placed on purely spiritual ground—viz. the absolute prohibition of Almighty God. Many of them are repeated over again in the twentieth chapter, with an enumeration of the sanctions or special penalties attached to the breach of them.

Now let us look carefully at the list of statutes thus solemnly fenced. It will be observed that they all refer to sins of the flesh, with one single exception, viz. the offering of

human
the
spiritu
2, 19,
numbe
use of
7, Bes
concer
one ot
to our
unspe
withi

At
ated i
Talk
twice,
father
of rea
doubl
'Tabl
tions
tions,
list of
from i

Al
the g
appro
naked
tion s
tende

'G
'expre
mothe
expres
the na
naked
brothe
presse
naked
mothe
mothe

human sacrifices to Molech; and this very exception proves the rule, seeing that idolatry is constantly spoken of as spiritual harlotry or fornication. (See Lev. xvii. 7; Hos. ii. 2, 19, 20; iii. 1.) The abominations denounced are seven in number:—1, Unlawful marriage. 2, Polygamy. 3, Improper use of marriage. 4, Adultery. 5, Human sacrifice. 6, Sodomy. 7, Bestiality. Of these horrors we are in this place happily concerned only with one directly, and indirectly perhaps with one other. But it is right for us to have the entire list present to our minds, in order that we may understand with what unspeakable abominations Almighty God classes marriage within degrees prohibited by Him.

And what are the prohibitions? Those actually enumerated in the admirably drawn scheme of Mr. Vincent's *Village Talk* are fifteen in number, nine of which are mentioned twice, viz. here and in the twentieth chapter, while one (the father's daughter) is named as many as three times. Parity of reasoning—*i.e.* arguing from one sex to the other—exactly doubles the fifteen, making it thirty, as in our authorized 'Table of Kindred and Affinity,' and a like number of relations is of course forbidden to the woman. All the prohibitions, however, may be taken as included in the well-known list of twelve contained in the memorial lines which we copy from Poole's *Synopsis (in loco)*:—

'Nata, soror, neptis, matertera, fratris et uxor,
Et patru conjunx, mater, privigna, noverca,
Uxorisque soror, privigni nata, nurusque,
Atque soror patris, conjungi lege vetantur.'

All these are given, we must observe, as illustrations of the general law stated in the sixth verse: 'None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness: I am the Lord.' Moreover, the slightest consideration shows us that they are only illustrations, and are not intended to form an exhaustive list.

'God by Moses,' says Bishop Hall (*Works*, folio 1662, p. 867), 'expressly forbade the uncovering of the nakedness of father and mother, He expressed not the nakedness of son and daughter: He expressly names the nakedness of the father's wife, He expresseth not the nakedness of the mother's husband: He expressly names the nakedness of thy sister, He expresseth not the nakedness of thy brother: He expresseth the nakedness of thy son's daughter, He expresseth not the nakedness of thy daughter's son: He expresseth the nakedness of thy father's wife's daughter, He expresseth not the mother's husband's son: He expresseth the father's sister, not the mother's brother: He expresseth the daughter-in-law, not the son-in-

law. So as by this rule, if it should be carried only by mere verbal expressions, a woman might marry her son-in-law : the nephew might marry his great-aunt : the niece her great-uncle : the daughter might marry her mother's husband's son : the grandmother might marry her daughter's son : the daughter might marry with her mother's husband. Were these things to be allowed the world would be all Sodom. These things, therefore, are of necessity included in the law by a clear analogy, no less than if they had been expressed.¹

We have ventured to quote in this place what is in fact but an illustration of our second canon of interpretation, because the quotation helps us to draw out a clear principle from the enumerated list of prohibitions. The principle is this : that a man must not marry any sort of mother, any sort of aunt, any sort of sister, or any sort of daughter ; and, in like manner, that a woman must not marry any sort of father, any sort of uncle, any sort of brother, or any sort of son. The word mother will include grandmother, mother-in-law, and step-mother. The word aunt will include father's sister, mother's sister, father's brother's wife, and mother's brother's wife. The word sister will include father's daughter, mother's daughter, brother's wife, and wife's sister. The word daughter will include grand-daughter, daughter-in-law, and step-daughter ; and the same inclusive meaning must of course be given to the words descriptive of male relations, either by consanguinity or affinity, whom the woman is by analogy forbidden to marry. For a full half of the stated prohibitions refer to relationship by affinity, which is consistently treated throughout as equivalent to consanguinity.

Here, then, is a perfect and perfectly intelligible law ; of universal application ; admitting on the face of it of no exception : ' totus teres atque rotundus.' On what ground is its plain principle to be assailed ?

First, attention is drawn to the sixteenth verse : 'Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife : it is thy brother's nakedness.' We are bidden to compare this with Lev. xx. 21, where the same command is repeated with a penalty attached, and with Deut. xxv. 5, &c., where an exception is taken to this law in a certain special case—a case, moreover, which was brought directly under our Lord's notice by the Sadducees (S. Matt. xxii. 24), and the exceptional rule

¹ The above passage is accurately quoted from Bishop Hall's Works, and is strictly in point for the principle which we desire to establish. It contains, however, as will be observed, a mistake as to a matter of fact, there being no prohibition against marrying a father's wife's daughter, if she be not also the father's own daughter, in the Levitical law. See Lev. xviii. 11.

respecting which was not repealed or in any way condemned by Him. We are asked to draw the inference that a law so confirmed by statutory penalty, and so excepted to in a particular case, could be only a Jewish national ordinance, and not a moral law of universal or even general obligation. Then we are further asked to draw the parallel between brother's wife and wife's sister, and to give licence, free and unreserved, in both cases. This is a very modern argument which could hardly have been urged thirty years ago; and the fact of its being urged now, as we have repeatedly heard it urged, shows what a wound has already been inflicted on the delicacy of public moral feeling by the ceaseless agitation of the last half-century on this subject. Even yet, however, public feeling does revolt against the idea of marriage with a brother's widow. We were ourselves present not very long ago at an influential meeting held under the auspices of the Marriage Law Reform Association, and by the courtesy of the chairman were permitted to bear testimony against the proposed relaxation of the law. A very remarkable circumstance connected with the meeting was this: a lady who was present, an eager Marriage Law Reformer, who had been prepared to advocate relaxation in both directions at once, had the candour to say that she had called that very morning on thirteen women, whom she took to be fair representatives of the sex in various classes of life, to enlist their sympathies in favour of general licence in this matter. But of the thirteen, she found that nine were entirely and thoroughly opposed to a woman being permitted to marry a deceased husband's brother; and this experience (the lady admitted) had severely shaken her own convictions about this relationship. But as we have hinted, a few years ago the so-called reformers were most anxious to assert that the cases of deceased wife's sister and deceased husband's brother were by no means parallel; saying that there was a physiological objection in the latter case which did not exist in the former. They did not tell us even then why a man was forbidden to marry the mother or the daughter of his deceased wife, relationships as to which physiological considerations could afford them no help whatever.

Surely the answer on the whole subject of the husband's brother is this: The Divine Author of all morality has power to dispense with His own law if He pleases, and under certain very rare circumstances of necessity or propriety He is pleased to do so. Those who hold mankind to be descended from one pair, and who believe that 'God hath made of one blood all

nations of men,' must believe that He did so with respect to the second generation of men.¹ He did so in commanding Abraham's obedience in the sacrifice of Isaac. He did so in commanding the extermination of the Canaanites by the sword. And if He were pleased to consider the ancestorship of the Messiah or the Sacramental inheritance of the Holy Land a sufficient reason for specific interference with the universal law of marriage, who should say Him nay? Moreover, the concession, or rather the command, was limited to those cases in which the natural consequence of marriage, the birth of issue, had not ensued.

We cannot, however, pass over unnamed, much as we should like to do so in order to show how utterly foreign we deem it to our present subject, what learned professors call the *locus classicus*, '*the only passage*,' bearing on the question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, the famous eighteenth verse, 'Neither shall thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her lifetime.' With respect to it we must bear in mind that we have so far had what we believe to be a perfect Divine law resting on clear and intelligible principles; and that, by parity of reasoning from the case of the brother's wife, that law has at least seemed to forbid marriage with a wife's sister. We must also bear in mind that the unlawfulness of all the unlawful unions hitherto spoken of has rested on one reason: to wit, nearness of kin.

To contravene such a law resting on such a reason we should at least expect to find an exception to the law clearly stated, recognizing, even if it were only to evade, the stated reason, and not a merely permitted exception to a new prohibition, which prohibition itself rested on a totally different reason. We would submit, then, that *any* plausible interpretation of the eighteenth verse which did not seem to contradict the law just enunciated were preferable to any other interpretation which did seem to contradict it. Now, there are several such interpretations. Those who defend the existing law are in no way bound to make any absolute choice among these. We may hold with John Keble that the expression 'in her lifetime' is merely intended to emphasize the general prohibition against taking a wife to her sister; or we may refer the words 'in her lifetime' to the sister so forbidden to be

¹ 'Who was Cain's wife?' is the commonest of all questions among infidel operatives: the suggested inference of course being that if she was, as she must have been, his sister, the laws of sexual morality have no satisfactory foundation.

taken, and construe the command thus, 'Thou shall not marry thy sister-in-law so long as she lives;' or we may adopt the marginal rendering 'one wife to another,' and construe the text as prohibitory of polygamy; or, yet again, we may accept another ancient interpretation, and say that we have here an exception to the law of Levirate marriage,¹ declaring that even the holy entail protected thereby must be allowed to lapse, in case the brother's widow should happen to stand also in the relation of sister to the living wife. We really are not concerned to choose among these explanations. It is for our opponents to *prove* (which we submit they have never done) that this verse will not admit of any other fair and reasonable construction save that of an implied permission to marry the sister of a deceased wife. It seems to us, indeed, that the interpretation given by the writers favourable to relaxing our law gets them into hopeless difficulty at every turn. As the Bishop of Lincoln points out:—

'If it were allowable to infer that, because a man is forbidden to marry his wife's sister during his wife's lifetime, *therefore* he may marry her after his wife's death, it would be equally reasonable to infer that because he may not marry his wife's sister in his wife's lifetime, he may marry *any other* person who is not his wife's sister. But this was expressly forbidden by the Law of God. The fact is that (as Hooker says) it is altogether inconsistent with a right interpretation of the Holy Scriptures to imagine that a thing *denied* with special circumstance doth import an *opposite affirmation* when that circumstance is expired. . . . Christ promised to be with the Apostles *until the end of the world*. Will He begin to be absent from them then? No: He will come then in His glorified body, and they will be *for ever with the Lord*. If, then, our English translation represents correctly here the sense of the original, the meaning of this verse is, that though a man's wife may become aged, infirm, or ungracious, and though her sister may be more fair and attractive in person and disposition, yet he may not espouse the sister in addition to the wife, *however long the wife may live*. And this prohibition may have been occasioned by the case of the patriarch Jacob, who, under extenuating circumstances, married Rachel, the sister of Leah, his wife, in her lifetime; and whose example, by reason of his patriarchal dignity, might perhaps be construed into a dangerous precedent.'

The Right Reverend Prelate further points out in a note, as justifying his own contention that polygamy is the real sin prohibited in this verse, that in Hebrew anything is called *ish* (man) or *ishah* (woman). In Exod. xxv. 20, the correspon-

¹ Gerhard, *De Conjugio*, p. 377 ed. Genevæ, 1639.

dence of the faces of the cherubim to one another is described by the phrase 'one man to his brother.' In Exod. xxvi. 3, the curtains in like manner are said to be coupled 'one woman to her sister.' Nay, he quotes from the Rev. Charles Forster a statement that the phrase 'a man to his brother' or 'a woman to her sister' occurs two-and-forty times in the Hebrew Bible without once designating the blood relationship of sisters or brothers, but always meaning (when used of persons) *two men together or two women together*. 'If, therefore, this expression designates in Lev. xviii. 18 the blood relationship of two sisters, I can only say that this is *the solitary instance in the whole Bible where it has such a meaning*.'

Now, we are not disposed, as we said before, to lay undue stress on any of these criticisms, or to favour exclusively any of the interpretations adduced. But with such criticisms only plausibly adducible, and with such interpretations barely possible, we ask very solemnly indeed whether it can be safe for a Christian State to make this disputed verse a reason for relaxing a law which, but for it, would appear to be most plain in itself, and to rest on the very plainest of principles.

We are almost ashamed to mention an argument which some of the Marriage Law Reformers have thought to be deducible from this verse, to the effect that though under its provisions marriage with a wife's sister would be not simply illicit, but incestuous, yet the death of the wife would at once bar the incest.¹ Do they mean us really to conclude that all relationship by marriage ceases at the moment when marriage is itself dissolved by death? and that consequently a widower is left at perfect liberty to marry mother-in-law, or step-daughter, or daughter-in-law? If they mean this, surely the words of Holy Scripture are entirely against them. If they do not mean this, to what purpose is the argument alleged at all? If the bond of affinity be dissoluble in one case, it is dissoluble in all: if not dissoluble in all, it is dissoluble in none.

What now in brief is the history of the law now so much called in question? During the first three centuries from the Christian era no authentic document is found bearing on the subject. Indeed, it is remarkable that our earliest information connected with the fourth century comes from a political rather than from an ecclesiastical source. For it is found in a record of the Roman civil law being altered in two particulars. That law was altered so as to forbid, firstly, the

¹ *The Present State of the Marriage Law*, by a Graduate (Hatchard & Co. : 1863), pp. 28-34, *et alibi*.

marriage of uncle and niece ; and secondly, the marriage of a man with his wife's sister. The latter change was made A.D. 355 by the Emperors Constantius and Constans in the following words :—' Although the ancients thought it lawful, when the marriage of the brother was dissolved, to marry the brother's wife, and also, after the woman's death or divorce, to contract marriage with her sister, let all abstain from marriages of this sort, nor think that legitimate children can be born of this union.'¹

This was doubtless, in fact, the raising of the old heathen law to a Christian standard. And some fifteen years or more after this we find S. Basil the Great addressing a letter to one Diodorus, who had written to request his opinion on the lawfulness of marriage with the sister of a deceased wife. S. Basil speaks with horror of the suggestion, declaring that whenever such unions had occurred, they had never been reckoned by Christians as hallowed by the name of marriage. Alluding to the want of any express prohibition in words occurring in Lev. xviii. he says :—

' It is not written in these laws that father and son ought not to cohabit with one woman ; and yet by the prophet it is denounced as the greatest of crimes, "for the son," it is said, "and the father have gone in to one woman." But I maintain that this point is not passed over in silence, but that the lawgiver hath forbidden it in the very strongest manner ; for the expression "None of you shall approach unto any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness," embraceth also this species of relationship. For what can be more akin to a man than his own wife, or rather his own flesh ? for "they are no longer twain, but one flesh !" So that by means of the wife the sister also passeth into the kindred of the husband ; so that as he shall not take the mother of his wife, nor the daughter of his wife, because he shall not take his own mother or his own daughter, so in like manner he shall not take the sister of his wife, because he cannot take his own sister. And on the other hand, neither shall it be lawful for a woman to marry the kindred of her husband, for on either side the rights of kindred are common to both.'²

So far as the Western Church was concerned, we must in candour admit that the practice of multiplying prohibitions began very early, a doctrine of spiritual affinity (*i.e.* relationship between sponsors and those for whom they answered in baptism, and also between sponsors for the same baptized person with reference to each other) being superadded to the nearness of kin spoken of in Holy Scripture ; and there is

¹ See Pusey's *Preface to Evidence*, pp. lii. liii.

² S. Basil, *Ep.* cxi.

too much reason to suppose that the object of these prohibitions, which extended now to the fourth, and now to the seventh degree, was to obtain money for Papal dispensations or licences to disregard them. These dispensations began about the year 1100, in the time of Paschal II. That Pope ventured to dispense in a clear case of adultery, conniving at the union of Philip I., King of France, who had another wife then living, with Bartrade, who was herself already married to the Count of Anjou.¹ The first Pope who dispensed in the case of marriage with the sister of a deceased wife was Martin V., who, in the tenth year of his pontificate—that is to say, about the year 1427, granted permission to one John ‘comes Fuxius’ to espouse Blanche the sister of his former wife Joanna. The reasons for this permission, as recited in the dispensation itself, were two: first, that Joanna had died childless, from which it is clear that this was no case of an aunt being required to perform the duty of a stepmother to her brother-in-law’s children; and secondly, that such a marriage was absolutely necessary in order to secure the succession to the sovereignty of Navarre, and so to prevent war and bloodshed.² The strong assertion of the historian that this was the first instance ever known of such a dispensation³ is in itself direct evidence as to what the law and custom of the Western Church had been for fourteen hundred years. About the year 1500 Alexander VI. (Borgia) granted a dispensation to Emanuel, King of Portugal, to marry the sister of his deceased wife, and afterwards another to Ferdinand II., King of Sicily, to marry his aunt. The Council of Trent, in order probably to shield those monstrous exercises of a dispensing power, pronounced an anathema on those who deny the Levitical degrees to be dispensable:—‘Si quis dixerit, eos tantum consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradus, qui Levitico exprimuntur, posse impedire matrimonium contrahendum, et dirimere contractum, nec posse Ecclesiam in nonnullis eorum dispensare, aut constituere, ut plures impediunt, anathema sit.’⁴

The English Reformers, while rejecting all the restrictions which the Roman Church had added to the Levitical Law, agreed in the main in holding, and formulated under Archbishop Parker, by the Table of prohibited degrees, the doctrine that marriage with a deceased wife’s sister is forbidden.

¹ Thomassinus, *De Vet. et Nov. Disc.*, Pars II. lib. iii. c. 28, n. 10.

² Baronius, *Ann. Ecc.*, in Martinum V. pp. 500, 501, ed. Luc.

³ Thomassinus, Pars II. lib. iii. c. 29, n. 10. (See a letter by Mr. Knight Watson in the *Guardian* of December 13, 1882.)

⁴ *Conc. Trident.* sess. 24, can. 3.

Bishop Jewel, indeed, apparently changed in 1563¹ the opinions which he had expressed two years before adverse to these marriages. But it was only in appearance. For whereas his utterance in 1561² is an elaborate argument founded on careful exposition of Holy Scripture, the later utterance is only a passing peevish expression contained in a letter to Parker, to the effect that he wished the subject altogether out of his way. In the seventeenth century there was absolutely no difference of opinion among the Protestant theologians of England, Scotland, and the Continent. The Eastern Church has from the beginning held the union unlawful, and has never allowed dispensations. It is right to add that in Russia the State allows such marriages among Dissenters only. But, as a general rule, the whole of the Eastern Church, including the various heretical bodies which adhere to its discipline, observe carefully, in obedience to the Council of Trullo (A.D. 692), all which up to the time of S. Basil was regarded as unwritten custom, dating from immemorial antiquity; and their rule—from which, be it remembered, there is no dispensing power—is a far stricter one than any which the Western Church, much less this realm of England, has ever submitted to.

Even the Mohammedan law forbids marriage with two sisters, and that without any expression of limitation to the lifetime of either :—

‘Ye are forbidden to marry your mothers, and your daughters, and your sisters, and your aunts, both on the father’s and on the mother’s side, and your brother’s daughters and your sister’s daughters, and your foster-mothers and your foster-sisters, and your wives’ mothers, and your step-daughters born of your wives, and the wives of your sons who proceed out of your loins; and ye are also forbidden to take to wife two sisters’ (*Koran*, chap. iv. 4).

In France, under the old Republic, marriage with a deceased wife’s sister was at first allowed, but, owing to the bad effects which followed, this law was changed.³ Under the Code Napoléon it was absolutely forbidden, and no dispensations were allowed. The same thing was done about uncle and niece. By the law of 1832, both are admitted by dispensation for grave reasons; it being strongly laid down that prohibition must be the rule, and dispensation the exception. The state of the law in Holland is of the same nature. In Germany great licence is now permitted; and as a result we

¹ *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, Parker Society, p. 176.

² *Jewel’s Letters*, Parker Society, p. 1244.

³ Preface to Pusey’s *Evidence*, p. lxxxii.

have it in evidence before the Royal Commission that 'all domestic relations are broken up: the uncle's house cannot be the home for the orphan niece, nor the sister-in-law take charge of her deceased sister's children, since marriage is permitted.' All the cantons of Switzerland, with (we believe) one exception, have yielded, and allow these unions either under dispensation or otherwise. Our own colonies, we grieve to say, have not been true to the traditions of the mother country; while Republican America has a sad tale of licence to tell.

'It is evident,' writes an American clergyman, 'to those of us who are old enough to remember the state of things previous to these innovations, that a change for the worse has been brought about. I can well recollect when ladies in the lifetimes of their husbands used to feel as if their brothers-in-law were their *own* brothers, and to treat them accordingly, in all the unreserve of domestic intercourse; when a brother-in-law, after an absence, would kiss his brother's wife in all purity as his own sister, and she would confide in him without a thought of evil, or a feeling of embarrassment; and when, too, in case of a wife dying, her sister would remain in charge of her family, or would remove to the bereaved home, to live with the widower, and take care of his children as a thing of course, without a whisper of slander, or any occasion for it; when the children, too, knowing that their aunt could never be in any nearer relation to them, loved and revered her, and confided in her, and yielded readily a most wholesome influence to her.

'But since such increased nearness of connexion has been deemed not improper and even desirable, there has grown up in families a perceptible and painful constraint; the children learning to look with apprehension on their mother's sisters, and the wives becoming jealous of their influence with their husbands, while familiarities which formerly were thought to be, and really were, innocent, have come to possess a consciousness of evil tendency which itself is of the nature of sin.

'I know of a wife whose health was gradually declining, a woman of the world, with a husband as worldly as herself, and in their house was a young and attractive sister of hers, between whom and her husband there had grown up gradually a degree of affectionate intercourse which in the days of the wife's health had been thought only natural. But as her end drew near, it became on his part more pointed, and drew to it her attention so agonizingly that it became the one engrossing feeling of her soul for the last few weeks of her life, exciting in her an undisguised dread of what she foresaw would, as it did, take place, and so absorbed her as to shut out all thought of religion, and make her miserable to her very death.'

These are facts vouched for in a letter addressed to the late Lord Hatherley, and published by him. The writer

naturally desired to conceal his name, but declared that, if the facts were questioned, he was perfectly ready to substantiate his statement.

And what has been the history of our own country in this matter? It has been briefly this: Before 1563 the Canon Law, with its prohibitions and possible dispensations, was in force; save that for some years immediately preceding that date (interrupted only by the short reign of Queen Mary) Papal dispensations had not been allowed to run. Archbishop Parker drew up our existing Table of prohibited degrees, which was set forth by authority in 1563, and is confirmed and made specially binding on the consciences of the clergy by the ninety-ninth Canon. The principle of this Table is precisely what we have indicated above as conformable to Holy Scripture. It counts man and wife to be one flesh, and forbids marriage with the relations of either up to the third degree inclusive. It has commonly been said that from 1563 to 1835 marriage with the sister of a deceased wife was voidable, but not void. A certain justification can be pleaded for this statement, which we will presently explain, but such unions were so far absolutely void as that, even after the death of one party, the survivor could still be punished for the incest committed during cohabitation.¹ Thus much, however, is true, that the Civil Courts would not allow the legitimacy of children born in such quasi-wedlock to be questioned after the death of either parent; and, so far as the Ecclesiastical Courts were concerned, it became a common and shameful practice for some friend of the parties to institute a collusive suit and, by keeping that suit unprosecuted, to prevent any other plaintiff from prosecuting to conviction. The offenders were in fact nearly all wealthy people. One result of the Royal Commission was to bring out this circumstance, which is of some value to those who think they are called upon to emancipate the poor from a galling yoke, that of 1,648 marriages which were found to have taken place within the forbidden degrees, only forty had occurred among the poorer classes. In 1835 Lord Lyndhurst's Act was passed—an Act which cannot be otherwise described than as being, in the strict meaning of the word, unprincipled. For in order to create a legitimate heir to a great patrician house, it made a breach of God's Law to be counted lawful in the past, while, yet the same should be counted unlawful for the future. It pronounced all marriages between widowers and the sisters of

¹ See Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, pp. 736, 739.

their deceased wives which had taken place up to that date to be valid, and the children born of such unions to be legitimate, while it made such unions for the future void by special statutory enactment, and no longer by merely general adoption of the Church's Law. This had, however, the effect of putting an end to the collusive suits spoken of above.

Very shortly after this piece of legislation was perpetrated, began that disastrous agitation which has wounded so terribly the national conscience, and which at this time, unless the danger be averted by God's good hand upon us, threatens a ruin far more terrible (to use Lord Hatherley's comparison) than would be the landing of 300,000 French at Dover. The Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, as it has been called, was first introduced to the House of Commons by Lord Ellesmere, then Lord Francis Egerton, in 1842.¹ Its history has been briefly this: It has been four times thrown out in the Commons; it has once passed a second reading in the Commons, and broken down on the motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair; it has three times passed a second reading in the Commons, and broken down in Committee; it has once been sent up to the Lords from the Commons, and withdrawn without a division; it has been five times sent up from the Commons to the Lords, and thrown out by them; and it has been five times initiated in the Lords, and rejected there. In-

Date	Result	Numbers
1842	Rejected in the Commons	123-100
1847	Royal Commission appointed	
1849	Lost in the Commons' Committee	
1850	Passed the Commons. Withdrawn in the Lords	50-16
1851	Rejected in the Lords	
1855	Lost in the Commons' Committee	
1856	Rejected in the Lords	43-19
1858	Passed the Commons. Rejected in the Lords	46-22
1859	Passed the Commons. Rejected in the Lords	49-39
1861	Rejected in the Commons	174-155
1862	Rejected in the Commons on the motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair	148-116
1866	Rejected in the Commons	174-155
1869	Withdrawn in the Commons' Committee	
1870	Passed the Commons. Rejected in the Lords	77-73
1871	Passed the Commons. Rejected in the Lords	97-71
1872	Withdrawn in the Commons	74-49
1873	Passed the Commons. Rejected in the Lords	
1875	Rejected in the Commons	171-142
1879	Rejected in the Lords	101-81
1880	Rejected in the Lords	101-90
1882	Rejected in the Lords	132-128

1853 R. in L. at 3rd Reading
1884

terest has been specially called to the matter at this time, partly because of the unusual amount of energy and industry which has been thrown by the Earl of Dalhousie into his perilous task, partly because of the narrowness of the majority which ruled against the proposed change in the House of Lords last Session, the number of non-contents being 132 as against contents 128¹; but chiefly, and above all, owing to the prominent action taken in the matter by certain illustrious personages (one especially), who, on ordinary occasions, consider it a duty to abstain from anything which bears the least appearance of political partizanship.

In gathering up our results, let us try to arrive at some practical hints as to the way in which battle ought to be done for our God and for the purity of the marriage tie.

In the first place, let us put the proposed change on its right footing, as a national ignoring of law which God formulated for all nations, and as a degrading of that ideal of marriage which Christ has given us in the New Testament. We cannot but feel that justice was not done to this feature of the subject in the conduct of last Session's debate in the House of Lords. This consideration must come first of all, and of course, in the minds of those who accept it, must supersede the necessity for any other.

This paramount consideration first dealt with, it is of course fair to introduce social considerations also. As to this, it has been too much the fashion to regard all the sentiment as lying on one side of the argument. We are constantly asked, 'who so fit to take charge of a deceased woman's children as their aunt?' Unquestionably this is so, if she is recognized as an aunt, and not as a stepmother, who may too probably rear in her own household rivals in her affection to those very children. Then, is no consideration to be shown to those of the sterner sex on whose life a great shadow has fallen, and who, as things are, find in the affection of sisters-in-law, precisely because they are sisters and never can be more, a blessing perfectly unspeakable; and this all the same, whether they have thought of marrying again in the future or not? We believe these cases to be far more numerous than is generally thought. Within the circle of our own immediate acquaintance we have known several. In one single family, the head of the house, and his brother, and his son, were all left widowers; and, in each instance, recourse was had to the honourable and pure regard of the

¹ The same majority, though in a thinner House, had been obtained in 1870, when the numbers were—non-contents, 77; contents, 73.

wife's sister to help in patching up the old and desolate home, or in forming a new one. Moreover, in every one of these cases, had no such arrangement been practicable, the sister-in-law would have been turned out homeless on the world. This fact suggests another question, to wit: Is no consideration to be shown to the moral sensibilities of the sister-in-law herself? is she to be pointed out by statute as the proper Parliamentary successor of the wife,¹ and to be charged in the minds of the scandalous (if she enters the widower's house) with manifestly seeking that position? What modest woman can endure this? And why is the hardship of breaking tender ties to be inflicted on the great majority who are content with the law as it stands, in order to gratify a few people who cannot bring themselves to control desires which they knew were lawless when they first conceived them?

Is it nothing, again, that a Table of degrees, which rests on a clear principle, should be superseded by one which rests on no principle whatever? To allow marriage with a wife's sister and forbid it with a wife's niece is surely the very essence of legal absurdity. And what about the other relationships of affinity? It cannot be too often repeated that all must stand or fall together.

It has been said that this is a woman's question, and we believe it is. Then let the women of England bestir themselves and speak their minds. Let them draw up petitions to be signed by women only, and with these let them besiege the Legislature. Let them point out the unutterable selfishness of men in this matter. Every man of self-respect feels that it would be pollution to him to live with a woman who had been married to his brother. But he does not, it would seem, think a woman defiled by living with one who had been married to her sister. Is a woman's purity of less consequence than his? Is a man really to be allowed to say, 'I would not sully myself by marrying a woman already married to my brother; but if a woman chooses to marry me, who have before married her sister, this does not sully me, and about her it does not signify'? Will not the whole female sex rise in arms against such selfish licentiousness as this?²

We have kept far in the background another question which, if ever the time for action comes, it will be impossible

¹ See Lord Coleridge's speech in the House of Lords, delivered on Friday, June 25, 1880.

² See a powerful sermon by the Rev. Henry Carrington, Dean and Rector of Bocking (Longmans: 1850).

to ignore: viz. the position of the clergy, who will still be bound by the law of their Church, whatever Parliament may do. It has been the fashion to quote the name of Dean Hook as favourable to the proposed change. It should never be forgotten that he spoke of it as an intolerable burden to lay on the souls of the clergy that they should be forced to solemnize such marriages.¹ And the difficulty does not end there. What about admitting to Communion brothers and sisters who are united in this unholy bond? What, again, about those cases (and we know of such) where the clergy have exercised a legitimate moral influence and have effectually advised such sinners to repent and to separate from those with whom they were living in sin? What, again, about cases where penitents, so separated, have formed new ties which, as the law stands, they are quite entitled to do, and in many instances have done?

There is yet one point on which we could desire to address respectfully, yet fearlessly, our Right Reverend Fathers in God. The Bishops of England, with some few exceptions, have earned the undying respect of those who reverence God's Law in this behalf, by the noble stand which they have made from first to last in the House of Lords.² We ask them now very earnestly whether, in case this unhappy proposal should pass the Legislature, they are prepared as a body to give their clergy distinct, uniform, and consistent advice how to act? We have of course our own opinion as to how the clergy ought to act. But it will be important for our Prelates to speak. Will they tell us that these unions are simply to be treated as irregular marriages which time and faithfulness will purge, and the perpetrators of which may after an interval without separation be admitted to Communion? or will they say boldly and with united front that the whole thing is pollution from first to last, and that they will support their clergy in treating it as such?

The whole question seems at present to be in the hands, under God, first, of English women, and secondly, of English Bishops. Let these two classes of persons for once come boldly to the front. Let English Bishops tell their clergy how to act. Let English women speak their minds, and call

¹ Speech of Lord Houghton in the House of Lords, Tuesday, May 6, 1879. There is, moreover, a passage in his life of Archbishop Parker which hints at least at a modification of the Dean's earlier opinion on the main question. See *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. ix. (new series iv.) pp. 301-2, footnote.

² Especially do we welcome the feeling and thoughtful utterance of the Bishop of Exeter, delivered at his recent Diocesan Conference.

for support on those who love their Bibles, on those who reverence the deep foundations of ancient law, on those who regard the Church as the Divinely-appointed keeper and expounder of Holy Writ; and, lastly, on those who believe the sacred mystery of the marriage-tie, and treat social purity as the foundation of family happiness. Then will we trust in God to avert the evil which threatens us, and give one more new reading to the oft-repeated phrase, 'Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.'

ART. VIII.—CAN UNFERMENTED WINE BE USED IN THE HOLY COMMUNION?

1. *Wines : Scriptural and Ecclesiastical.* By NORMAN KERR, M.D., F.L.S. (London, 1881.)
2. *Thoughts for Christians on Bible Wines and Temperance.* By the Rev. WILLIAM CAINE, M.A. (Manchester, 1876.)
3. *Holy Scripture : Temperance and Total Abstinence.* By WILLIAM BONNER HOPKINS, Vicar of Littleport, &c. (London, 1879.)
4. *Diocesan Addresses.* By C. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. (Lincoln and London, 1876.)
5. *A Reply to a Pamphlet by the Rev. William Ritchie on the Scripture Testimony against Intoxicating Wine.* By the Rev. HENRY TATTAM, LL.D., D.D., F.R.S., Rector of Stanford Rivers. (London, 1859.)
6. *The Wines of the Bible : an Examination and Refutation of the Unfermented Wine Theory.* By the Rev. A. M. WILSON. (London, 1877.)
7. *The Church of England Temperance Chronicle.* (London, 1878-1882.)

It will be within the recollection of our readers that upon two previous occasions we have felt it our duty, in the true interests of the work of the Church of England Temperance Society, to call attention in the pages of this *Review* to the dangerous tendencies of exaggerated teaching in regard to the use of wine and strong drink.¹ No cause, however excellent, can be advanced either by perversions of the meaning of Holy

¹ *The Church Quarterly Review*, July 1879, 'The Scriptural View of Wine and Strong Drink;' January, 1880, 'The Church of England Temperance Society.'

Script
liberty
such a
large
from
reason
of diff
in te
simila
subje
misch
societ
cheap
'the
a larg
the u
M
press
have
teach
the
some
the g
In a
alrea
in G
holie
refer
Scrip
the
whic
to pr
the
not
larg
tion
fluid
tigh
the
The
com

Scripture or by aggressive attacks upon lawful Christian liberty; and when a society even seems to favour methods such as these, it will undoubtedly forfeit the confidence of a large body of its most useful members and hinder waverers from joining its ranks. What was then written has, we have reason to believe, been found useful by some in the resolution of difficulties which had come across them, while their energy in temperance work has not been diminished. It is with similar aims in view that we approach the consideration of a subject which we feel has in it the elements of very serious mischief to interests higher than those of any movement or society, and which, in consequence of the dissemination of cheap literature and the teachings of such organizations as 'the Good Templars' and the 'Blue Ribbon Army,' is causing a large amount of perplexity in many quarters. We refer to the use of 'unfermented wine' in the Holy Communion.

Many of our readers may perhaps be unaware of the pressing nature of this question, but it cannot be said that we have been unwarned of the real tendencies of much teetotal teaching.¹ In 1876 the Bishop of Lincoln drew attention to the danger likely to ensue 'by recommending, and even in some cases by enforcing, the use of the unfermented juice of the grape for the Eucharistic cup in the Holy Communion.' In a charge delivered that year he pointed out that this was already the practice in upwards of eight hundred congregations in Great Britain, and that it might lead 'to a schism in the holiest of temperance societies, the Church, and this in reference to the holiest act, the Holy Communion.'² 'The Scripture Wine Question' has been frequently discussed in the pages of the *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, in which Dr. Norman Kerr and other writers have endeavoured to prove that this unfermented wine is a fact.³ So long as the matter was treated simply as a matter of science it did not occasion any serious anxiety. It does not require any large amount of scientific information to know that fermentation is a natural process; and that, if bottles containing the fluid described as unfermented wine are obliged to be kept tightly corked up lest they should ferment, nature is against the practical chemists who manufacture these beverages. The subject, however, has recently assumed an aspect which compels the attention of Churchmen. On May 2, 1881, the

¹ Archdeacon Tattam had expressed apprehensions of its results in 1859 in the excellent tract placed at the head of this article.

² *Diocesan Addresses*, 1876, p. 46.

³ *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, Dec. 13, 1879.

annual service of the Church of England Temperance Society was held in S. Paul's Cathedral. In the course of an admirable sermon preached on this occasion, the Bishop of Bedford took occasion to express the pain felt by himself and 'very many loving reverent minds at the mistaken and uncharitable attacks that have been made by fanatical partizans upon the use of fermented wine in the Holy Sacrament.' The remark which, in an assembly of Churchmen, might have been supposed to be universally accepted, was not left unchallenged. Two days afterwards, at the annual meeting of the Total Abstinence Section, Dr. Kerr stated, amidst cheers, that 'the pure juice of the grape, unfermented and unintoxicating, was the only kind of wine which common sense, scientific research, and a special study of the subject, left him free to believe his Saviour made and God's Holy Word commended the moderate use of.' More important, however, was the announcement made by the Rev. Edgar Jacob, of Portsea, that, 'with the consent of the Lord Bishop of Winchester, he conducted once a month the celebration of the Holy Communion with unfermented wine.' He earnestly hoped 'that this may be allowed to be an open question.' The Bishop of Bedford was charged by a correspondent of the *Chronicle* with 'denouncing him and hundreds, if not thousands more,' for their use of unfermented wine,¹ and shortly afterwards, as a specimen of what is going on, two clergymen in South London publicly stated at a meeting at which a lecture upon the subject had been given by Surgeon-General C. R. Francis, that 'they saw no reason why they should not produce "this liquid" at the Lord's Table, and they proposed therefore to introduce it.'² One of the foremost leaders of the 'Blue Ribbon Army'—Mr. W. Forbes—is reported to have said that 'fermented wine at the Lord's Supper is a great danger and a great snare.' A clergyman who presided over the meeting took the opportunity to announce that 'as he believed that some weaker brethren were made to offend by it, he had given up using anything in his church but unfermented wine.' Far more serious, however, considering the occasion and the circumstances under which they were uttered, were Dr. N. Kerr's utterances at the Church Congress in Derby.³ 'In every intoxicating cup,' he said, 'the enemy of the reformed inebriate waits for him. . . . Let us demand as an act not of mercy but of justice, not as a favour but as a right, . . . that the Church shall no longer

¹ *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, May 14, 1881.

² *Ibid.* July 2, 1881.

³ On October 5, 1882.

endanger his safety by the proffer of his inveterate foe under the guise of sanctity.' The paper in which these words occur is pronounced by the *Church of England Temperance Chronicle* to be 'one of the most useful from his pen.' A well-known archdeacon was in the chair on this occasion, and the speaking was almost entirely in the hands of clergymen, yet not a single protest was raised. In *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical* (p. 147), we are informed by Dr. Kerr that 'in the Church of England, as in nearly all religious denominations in the United Kingdom, in many parishes, while the parish church communicates in fermented wine, the incumbents use unfermented wine in their mission stations.' He knows, he says, of two bishops who 'have authorized the use of unfermented wine at the Lord's Table, and I know,' he adds, 'of other members of the Episcopal bench who have communicated in this wine and have made no sign' (p. 149). Some 1,800 congregations¹—an increase of 1,000 since 1876—have adopted the use of 'Frank Wright's unfermented wine;' and, although there is no doubt that of these a large number are Dissenting, it is also certain that the practice is far too common among ourselves.²

The objection to the use of fermented wine in Holy Communion does not stand by itself. If, without any reservation as to quality or quantity, 'fermented intoxicating wine is a narcotic poison, poisonous alike to body and brain' (*Wines &c.* p. 10); if alcohol, no matter whether anhydrous or not, is 'a demon;' if it is 'a poison of virtue, morals, and religion;' and has the power (perhaps denied to any other known article) of 'almost instantaneously intensifying the vilest passions of the soul;' then, no doubt, the use of this 'sin-generating element'³ in the Eucharist is at least a serious difficulty. We do not

¹ Reported speech in *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, July 2, 1881. Owing to the influence of 'Blue Ribbon' teaching, this number is, we fear, increased.

² As some clergymen may have been induced to adopt the use of unfermented wine in consequence of the following note in *Holy Scripture and Temperance* (p. 95), by Canon W. B. Hopkins, who, it will be remembered, is 'Chairman of the Committee on Intemperance of the Convocation of Canterbury,' we feel reluctantly obliged to call attention to it. 'Of living authorities, two, the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Lincoln, are reported to have given opposite decisions upon this point. The Archbishop allows liberty (only insisting upon "the fruit of the vine"), while the Bishop of Lincoln restricts his clergy to the use of fermented wine only.' We do not doubt that Canon Hopkins made this statement in perfect good faith, but we are enabled to say, on the highest authority, that the Archbishop 'never gave sanction to the use of unfermented wine.'

³ *Communion Wine*. By the Rev. W. Reid, D.D. Edinburgh.

quote the language, which reminds us of the worst excesses of Manicheism, willingly, but we must be consistent. As the Bishop of Peterborough remarked in his recent diocesan addresses, 'we cannot speak on Sunday in the most sacred part of the Communion Office of wine as a "creature of God," and on Monday denounce it as a creature of the devil.'

Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical, to which we propose to devote the larger portion of this review, is an expansion of a lecture delivered on November 1, 1881, in the Chapter House, S. Paul's, before the Church Homiletical Society. The exact connexion between the study of homiletics and wines is not very obvious, but we will let that pass. The admiring reporter of the *Church of England Temperance Chronicle* informs us that the lecture was illustrated by 'large diagrams of Hebrew and Greek words, and ancient descriptions of unintoxicating wines, by a forest of bottles, each containing a different variety of pure unfermented juice of the grape, by the analysis of various Tents, and by the entire process of the manufacture of unfermented wine, from the crushing of the cluster to the bottling of the wine.' The lecture is dedicated to the late Primate and other patrons and members of the Church Homiletical Society; and to the circumstances under which it was delivered we may, in part, attribute the attention which it has received.

The writer states that he is personally indifferent to the Bible wine question :

'The God of Nature is the God of Revelation, and there can be no contradiction between His Work and His Word. It has been demonstrated that fermented and distilled intoxicating liquors are irritant narcotic poisons. To teach that Christ made, and the Bible approved, the social use of fermented intoxicating wine is, therefore, to teach that He made, and the Bible sanctioned the social use of, a narcotic poison, poisonous alike to body and to brain—a proposition which seems to me to carry with it its own condemnation. Such being my position, the controversy that has raged so long and so fiercely over the wines of the Bible has no interest for me' (p. 10).

But 'the question has been thrust upon him' :

'Infidels deny to me the inspiration of the Bible, the Infallibility of its Author, and the Divinity of Christ, on the ground that the Bible approves, and He made, what all men of science know to be poison. These unbelievers exultingly quote to me the dogmatic assertion of a host of divines, that Christ made and the Bible commends, intoxicating wine. I have met Christians, too, who have opposed the beneficent total abstinence reform from the supposed Scripture sanction of intoxicating drink. For once, Christian divines and

avowed infidels have united in an interpretation of Scripture which places the Bible in direct antagonism to the facts of everyday life' (p. 11).

The real object of the book, however, is not only or chiefly to provide a method of meeting sceptical objections, in which it would signally fail, for, even if the wine at Cana was non-intoxicating, fermented wine is His work 'without Whom was not anything made that hath been made,'¹ nor yet to prove merely that the social use of intoxicating fermented wine is unlawful:

'My work as a physician with inebriate patients is marred, my labour as a Christian among the intemperate is to some extent undone, by the present very general use of intoxicating wine at the Communion' (p. 134).

He pleads 'for the poor, the helpless, and the weak.' He appeals accordingly to the bishops and clergy to study 'the evidence now before the Church for twelve months,' and, as a result of this study, 'to make her most sacred services safe for these weak brethren—the repentant dipsomaniac and the yet unfallen hereditary legatee of alcohol—by the celebration of the Lord's Supper with healthful, innocent, un-intoxicating wine' (p. 135).

This appeal deserves consideration, and if we feel compelled, so far as this *Review* may be considered to express the opinion of an important school in the English Church, to dissent altogether from the request so made, and to question the value of 'the evidence' upon which it is grounded, we wish once more to repeat that our observations must not be taken to indicate any lack of sympathy with those who are striving by all legitimate means to diminish the crime and curse of drunkenness, and to reduce the traffic in intoxicants to its legitimate dimensions. We believe that before the Church of England Temperance Society especially there is a future of wide usefulness, and of Dr. Kerr's own philanthropic labours we desire to speak with respect. Although he tells us that he has 'little time for philological or theological controversy,' it appears that he has read '5000 volumes of ancient and modern works with reference to the wine question,'² and he is, no doubt, sincerely convinced of the soundness of the conclusions at which he has arrived. We need, we hope, scarcely say how heartily we agree with the protests made by Canon Hopkins against even the slightest approach

¹ S. John i. 3.

² *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, Dec. 13, 1879.

to excess in the use of alcoholic drinks and against the partaking of ardent spirits as an ordinary beverage.¹ But the real importance of temperance work, the necessity which exists for it, and the energy with which it is conducted, are the measure of our regret at the adoption of an inconsiderate policy and merely showy arguments, which may produce a short-lived success, but will, we fear, end in a prolonged reaction.

Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical, would appear to the unlearned reader, for whose benefit it is mainly written, as a 'popular temperance handbook,' to be a work of considerable erudition. Reference is made, not only to medical and scientific authorities, but to the Fathers of the Church, to ecclesiastical historians, mediæval and modern Ritualists, and to an imposing array of archbishops and bishops, deans and archdeacons. But Dr. Kerr will scarcely blame us for observing that the materials for his work have been largely gathered from the *Temperance Bible Commentary* of Dr. F. R. Lees and the Rev. Dawson Burns. An estimate of the 'industry, scholarship, and acuteness of reasoning' displayed in that work has already been given in the pages of this *Review*: and in the article entitled 'The Scripture View of Wine and Strong Drink' Dr. Kerr's candidly acknowledged solution of the Bible wine question, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, has already been examined and, we think, refuted. But we wish to point out for the benefit of persons disposed to adopt an opinion which such a host of authorities and figures in Dr. Kerr's work seem to favour, that the fashion in which evidence of all kinds is jumbled together is an indication of some want of knowledge of the precise value of the authorities quoted. Gossiping books of travel tread closely on the heels of Professor Max Müller (p. 20); 'Columella, Julius I. 337, Augustine, 390,' elbow 'Gerarde, 1636,' or the 'Bishop of Rochester, F.R.S., 1702.' 'Homer, B.C. 850, Hippocrates, B.C. 400,' and 'Archbishop of Canterbury, 1737' (p. 51), assure us of the undoubted fact that 'in Greece the wine was generally mixed with water;' and the Rev. T. Harmer (*Obs.*, p. 149, fifth edition, London, 1816) remarks that 'sweet wines a few generations ago were preferred in England.' While 'in the region of philological speculation,' 'Bishop of London, 1770, Parkinson (*Theat. Bot.*),' Dr. Adam Clarke, or 'Harmer (*Obs.*),' the time-honoured Donnegan (pp. 64, 69), and many other divines and lexicographers of equal authority are quoted, there is a remarkable absence of reference to the familiar works of Dean Alford or Bishop Ellicott, the *Speaker's Commentary*, or the

¹ *Holy Scripture and Temperance*, p. 47.

Lexicons of Gesenius, Grimm, Bruder, and even Liddell and Scott. Accentuation is sometimes at fault: διὰ τῆς ρίζης εἰς οἶνον τρεῖς ὥστε ἐν τῷ φυτόν διὰ πολλὸν χρόνον γίνεται (p. 25), εἰργάσατο (*ib.*), βότρυας and ποτήριον (p. 136), can hardly be altogether due to the printer. Translation is not always successful; προσενέγκατε προσφοράν (*sic*) ἄρτον ἅγιον is scarcely 'approach with an offering of holy bread' (p. 136). 'Notemus quidem Christi sanguinem eadem hac die confici ex novo vino, si inveniri potest, aut aliquantulum ex matura uva in calicem expressa,'—'Let us note that some on this same day set forth the Blood of Christ from new wine, if it can be found, or from ripe grapes expressed into the cup' (p. 139); 'Cui symbolo licet substitui possit aliud,' &c.—'for which symbol it is lawful for another to be substituted,' are suggestive specimens. 'Botrus ante vixit' and 'in calice prematur' were certainly not written either by Durandus or S. Thomas Aquinas (p. 137). In the work of the Rev. W. Caine the confusion both of subjects and authorities is extraordinary, and we could have wished that in the more important books by Canon Hopkins and Dr. Kerr there had been some approach to uniformity in the description of the drinks against the use of which they desire to warn us. Sometimes we have 'fermented and distilled intoxicating liquors,' sometimes 'fermented intoxicating wine,' 'fermented liquors,' or 'alcoholic wine,' and then we are informed (*Wines* &c. p. 116) that the words 'fermented' and 'intoxicating,' though generally considered to be synonymous, are not absolutely so. In one passage Canon Hopkins appears to allow that the whole Bible 'settles absolutely the lawfulness and propriety of the moderate use of wine and strong drink,' while he thinks, as we do, that 'it remains an open question whether the use of ardent spirits is fitting at all if they be used as *béverages*,' and decides in the negative (pp. 20, 21); but elsewhere (p. 40) he says that 'it has yet to be proved that Holy Scripture allows the use of wine or strong drink, except on religious or festive occasions.' We have no desire to give any overdrawn description of the arguments of either of these writers, but it is obvious that when terms are so loosely used there must always be considerable risk of being misunderstood.

The medical aspects of the question have been already carefully treated in the pages of this *Review*,¹ and to deal with them is not the immediate object of the present article. We must, however, protest against the attempts of extreme advocates of total abstinence to prejudice the calm consideration

¹ In the article 'The Church of England Temperance Society,' Jan. 1880.

of the use of fermented wine in the Holy Communion by describing it as 'the sacramental use of a narcotic poison' (*Wines* &c. p. 126); or by grouping together, as if both were equally dangerous, 'fermented and distilled intoxicating liquors' (*Ib.* p. 10). We do not of course forget that pure anhydrous alcohol is, even in small quantities, a deadly poison; but it is not inconsistent with this statement to affirm that alcoholic drinks have a medicinal value, and in a large number of cases contribute to the nutrition of the body.

Dr. Kerr naturally places in the forefront of his work the familiar sentence from Sir W. Gull's testimony before the Lords' Committee on Intemperance, that 'alcohol is the most destructive agent known to us in this country' (p. 10), and Dr. Andrew Clark's *dictum*, 'alcohol is a poison, so is arsenic.'¹ Quite so; but this sentence of Dr. Clark's, to be really understood, must be read in connexion with what follows: 'It ranks with these agents; but of these agents, arsenic, strychnine, opium, and many others, there is this to be said, that in certain small doses they are useful in certain circumstances, and in certain very minute doses they can be habitually used without very *obvious*—mark what I say—prejudicial effect.' We have no wish whatever to diminish the weight attached to the utterances of so distinguished a physician as Dr. Clark; but it is undeniable that there is a very large number of persons in a state of what he calls 'secondary health' who are certainly benefited by a strictly moderate use of alcoholic drinks, and this Dr. Clark admits.² Sir William Gull did, no doubt, say before the House of Lords' Committee, that 'he knew alcohol to be a most deleterious poison' (10032), but it is not always remembered that he also said that he thought a man of twenty-five, 'sound in wind, limb, and health, much occupied out of doors, might find beer a good form of food; he could recommend beer as a light feeding material' (9996–9997). Sir W. Gull's warnings deserve most serious consideration, both from clergymen and physicians; but it is neither exact nor truly scientific to take evidence of this kind in merely detached sentences, and not as a whole.

But, as a matter of fact, the medical profession is far from unanimous in regard to the entire prohibition, in ordinary cases, of intoxicating drinks. If we cite an instance or two,

¹ The point is a small one, but it is an instance of the carelessness which characterizes the whole book that Dr. Kerr seems unable to quote accurately even in an instance like this. The sentence really runs: 'Alcohol is a poison, so is strychnine, so is arsenic, so is opium' (*The Action of Alcohol upon Health*, p. 4).

² *Ibid.* p. 6.

we only do so in order to remove difficulties which might otherwise meet us in considering the nature of the wine of the Eucharist. 'For young and active men' the *Lancet* (Jan. 1878) allows 'a glass of beer, or one or two glasses of claret at dinner; while men of middle age may with advantage stop at the third glass of claret, sherry, or port, and fear no ill result.' While Dr. Kerr assures us that 'a pint of pale ale contains $2\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of alcohol,'¹ in which case it is difficult to see how the business of the world could be carried on, for almost every moderate drinker would be intoxicated, Dr. Dyce Duckworth is equally positive that a pint of ordinary ale does not contain one-sixth part of an ounce of absolute alcohol, 'and,' he adds, 'two or three glasses of claret do not contain half an ounce of alcohol. To talk of drinking a pint of ale, or two or three glasses of claret, as being either harmful, or to be classed with careless taking of strong wine or but little diluted spirit, is practically almost ridiculous.'² Under certain conditions, Dr. Duckworth thinks that 'alcohol is truly a food,' and we believe that his opinion was shared by the late Dr. Parkes. But we do not pursue this part of the subject further. Instances might be largely multiplied, but it is sufficient to have shown that the dietetic value of alcoholic drinks is far from disproved. We object, altogether, in a work intended to be a popular handbook, dealing with a subject of so much delicacy as the wine of the Eucharist, to the indiscriminate use of the word 'alcohol,' as if every beverage contained the same proportion. Putting aside the division of opinion within the ranks of the medical profession, the incontrovertible fact that many of our leading statesmen and ecclesiastics who are non-abstainers are now doing an amount of work which puts many a younger man, albeit an abstainer, to shame, seems to us a practical proof that a moderate and guarded use of alcohol does not hinder capacity for exertion.

Nor need much be said in regard to Dr. Kerr's account of the Hebrew words translated 'wine' and 'strong drink' in the Old Testament. His conclusions are those of the *Temperance Bible Commentary* which have been already discussed in this *Review*, and more fully in Mr. Wilson's *Wines of the Bible* and Dr. Tattam's pamphlet. We can only find room for one or two specimens of our author's powers of exegesis. The well known passage, Hosea iv. 11, in which *thrôsh*, described in

¹ *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, July 12, 1879.

² *Ibid.*, Sept. 3, 1881.

thirty-seven other instances as a blessing, because, according to Dr. Kerr, it was 'unfermented and unintoxicating,' denoting 'a solid fruit, not a liquid wine,' is spoken of 'as taking away the heart,' in close connexion with a deadly sin, naturally occasions some perplexity. Dr. Kerr has, in the opening pages of his book, committed himself to the statement that the Bible speaks of a wine, *yayin*, which is a 'poison,' and of a wine, *yayin*, which is 'a good wine,' and 'maketh glad the heart of man.' But if *thrôsh*, 'described as a blessing,' can also be described, when misused, as an occasion of danger and sin, why should not a single sense of *yayin* bear alike God's approval and condemnation? It was pointed out in 'The Scriptural View of Wine and Strong Drink,' that this involved the total collapse of the argument in support of a duplicate meaning for *yayin*, and Dr. Kerr can only escape discomfiture by veiling the difficulty with a comment which does not touch the subject; 'But this is a taking away or alienation of the affections from God by absorption of all the faculties, irrespective of the nature of the object engrossing the heart' (*Wines &c.*, p. 90). The passage would certainly seem to refer to the stupid sottishness of the confirmed voluptuary produced by indulgence in wine and fleshly sin, but if Dr. Kerr is right in his inference that *thrôsh* denotes 'a solid fruit, and not a liquid wine,' we are driven to the astonishing conclusion that whoredom, and *yayin*, and eating grapes and raisins, have an equally demoralizing tendency. Nor are Dr. Kerr's etymologies more successful than his exegesis. On p. 94 an attempt is made to prove that *shehkâr* was a 'sweet drink' by arguments of a certain kind, ending with a remark by C. J. Addison, *Dam. and Palmyra*, ii. 190: 'At Damascus [at a shop] I called for *sookhar*.' It has already been shown (*Church Quarterly Review*, July 1879, p. 430) that this derivation will not stand, but for a complete refutation of arguments in its favour we will refer our readers to Mr. Wilson's work,¹ which, in spite of some minor defects, we consider most convincing here and elsewhere. *Shehkâr* may be the designation of a saccharine drink, but whether that sweet liquor was a fermented or unfermented beverage, whether or not it was no more than a 'naturally fermented wine, no stronger than our claret' (*Wines &c.*, p. 97), is only

¹ *The Wines of the Bible*, pp. 277-292. Dr. Kerr, in *Unfermented Wine: a Fact*, p. 32, says in regard to Mr. Wilson's work: 'into his theological and exegetical reasons . . . I decline to enter.' He thinks it sufficient to show 'that the ancient Jews could have had ample supplies of unfermented wine wherewith to celebrate' the Passover.

determined from the usage of the term itself. *Asis* is explained in a way which, to say the least, is incomplete. Dr. Kerr informs his readers that it 'occurs five times.' Most likely it represented the 'freshly expressed, and therefore unfermented juice of various fruits.' He then quotes three passages which he supposes prove its unintoxicating character, but, for the best of reasons, he passes in silence over the remaining two, Joel i. 5, and Isaiah xlix. 26, in which there is no question whatever that the effects ascribed to *asis* are those which an intoxicating liquor could alone produce. The catalogue of mistakes might be largely extended, but to do so would involve the quotation of whole chapters of this book. But as our author's object in this part of his book is to endeavour to prove that the unfermented wine only was approved by God in Old Testament days, and so to prepare his readers to accept the opinion that this fluid was used at the institution of the Eucharist, we feel bound to illustrate the untrustworthy character of his arguments.

In order to show that *oivos* in the New Testament is a general term for 'wine,' including both the unfermented and the fermented, Dr. Kerr has scattered throughout his book instances of changes in the meaning of words connected with his subject, in order to show that the term wine 'not necessarily always means the same kind' (p. 20). 'We must not,' he observes, 'conclude that the term wine, or its equivalent in other languages, as *oinos* or *vinum*, always meant precisely the same thing as we have been accustomed to call wine.' But we are not now concerned with mere grape-juice, but only with such grape-juice as was preserved and used as a beverage by the ancients, and unless Dr. Kerr's 'host of authorities'¹ can demonstrate that 'the expressed juice of the grape before fermentation,' which 'nearly all reliable authorities believe that the ancients were in the habit of drinking,' was the liquor preserved under the name of *wine* in the cask or bottle, poured into the drinking vessel, and served up at the festive gathering, they are in reality beside the question. We grant that *mustum* was not only drunk fresh but preserved, but where is the evidence that the term *vinum* includes *mustum*? We admit that a great variety of sweet wines were manufactured, sometimes by checking the fermentation, or by partially drying the grapes, or by converting them completely into raisins, but we have yet to learn that such preparations were simply called *oivos* or *vinum*. There is no evidence to

¹ Church of England Temperance Chronicle, Nov. 5, 1881.

show that these terms were used in any other way than 'as general terms for the fermented juice of the grape.'¹

But Dr. Kerr pleads that he has demonstrated in his essay, *Unfermented Wine: a Fact*, that the preparation and preservation of unfermented wine 'is not only possible, but simple and easy' (p. 29). That there are methods by which the natural process of fermentation may be artificially prevented we do not deny. Liebig and other chemists have, we believe, shown that it is quite possible: but, to use Mr. Wilson's words,² 'we respectfully submit that the facts can in no way determine the question whether the wines of the ancients, and of the Bible in particular, were fermented, or the reverse.' Able chemists and others may have discovered, by the aid of modern science, methods of preserving the juice of the grape unfermented, but what evidence is there that the modern discoveries have been anticipated by the ancients? Mr. Wilson has shown from the writings of Liebig and others that it is simply impossible to extract the juice from the grape as the ancients did it without inevitable fermentation,³ and if the expressed juice can only be preserved unfermented by destroying the yeast fungus 'by artificial means,' were they

¹ Among the few modern books of any real weight cited by Dr. Kerr is Dr. Smith's *Dict. Gk. and Rom. Ant.*, art. 'Wine.' His readers might infer that the learned contributor of that article, Professor Ramsay, agreed with the views of Dr. Kerr as to the usage of the terms *vinum* and *oīnos* to include both fermented and unfermented fluids. On the contrary, the statement quoted above gives the exact words with which the article opens, and we are obliged unwillingly to add that Dr. Kerr does not fairly represent the real sense of 'his old and venerated teacher's' remarks on *defrutum* and *sapa** (pp. 36, 44). Quoting from a work which he calls *Evan. Repos.*, Glas. June, 1877, he writes, 'We thought we remembered hearing our old professor, William Ramsay, maintaining that the *defrutum* of the Romans might be called un-intoxicating wine.' Professor Ramsay's own words, (Smith's *Dict. Gk. and Rom. Ant.*, p. 1002) express his real opinion; 'these grape-jellies, for they were nothing else, were used extensively for giving body to poor wines, and making them keep.' And again; 'observe that *mustum* is strictly the sweet juice of the grape before it had undergone any chemical change, although this word is sometimes used loosely for wines, as where Martial (l. 19) speaks of—'In Vaticanis condita musta cadis'; after fermentation it became *vinum* (*Rom. Ant.* p. 439). *Mustum*, on the contrary, is described by Professor Ramsay as 'sweet grape-juice.' Dr. Kerr includes *πρόχυμα* under the head of 'Greek and Roman Unintoxicating Wines.' He quotes half a sentence from *Dict. Ant.*, p. 1201, but omits to add, 'and was reserved for manufacturing a particular species of rich wine, &c.'

² *The Wines of the Bible*, p. 82.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 87–89.

* *Defrutum*. 'Vinum coquendo defraudatum defrutum dictum est, quod defrutetur, et quasi fraudem patitur. *Sapa*, mustum coctum, a sapore sic dici videtur.' Ducange.

acquainted with such methods of destruction? He has proved, we think, that except by boiling it, the ancients had no means of preserving the grape juice unfermented, and he has also made it clear that (1) there can be no doubt of the fact that a boiled wine may be, nevertheless, a fermented liquor; ¹ (2) that the purpose of the boiling was not to prevent fermentation, but that, by the evaporation of some of its alcohol, liquor already fermented might lose a portion of its alcoholic strength; (3) that the preparations of boiled grape-juice, known as *defrutum* and *sapa*, in other words, *mustum*, reduced to one-half and one-third its original bulk, were not 'unintoxicating wines,' but jellies, and can no more be regarded as favourite beverages than syrup can be classed among wines at present in ordinary use. We may remark that each of these positions in Mr. Wilson's book, to which we do not find the slightest reference in the general index to *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical*, finds ample confirmation in the writings of Dr. Kerr's favourite authority, Professor Ramsay, as everyone may see for himself by consulting the article *Vinum* in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* or pp. 437-439 of the *Roman Antiquities*.²

Our author's quotations from the classics are not very successful. If any of our readers should feel some difficulty in disposing of the testimony of Aristotle to the thick wine of Arcadia (p. 56), backed up by a Captain Sutherland's account of a remarkable discovery at Pompeii, we would refer them to Mr. Wilson (pp. 129-133) for a full explanation. But Dr. Kerr appeals to Anacreon, who, he thinks, speaks of unfermented grape-juice as wine;

μόνον ἄρσινες πατοῦσι
σταφυλήν, λύοντες αἶνον.—*Ode lii.*

This, he thinks, is conclusive, and so he triumphantly translates:—

Only males tread the grapes,
Setting free the WINE.

We will not be so cruel as to translate, but it is the duty of reviewers, as well as authors, to speak truth, and therefore we feel obliged to continue the quotation:—

¹ See e.g. *Dict. Gk. and Rom. Ant.* art. 'Calida,' p. 233.

² We would refer our readers to 'The Scriptural View of Wine and Strong Drink,' *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1879, pp. 414, 415.

μέγα τὸν Θεὸν κροτοῦντες
ἐπληροῖσιν ὕμνοις,
ἐρατὸν πῖθους ὄρωντες
νέον ἐς ζῶντα Βάκχος.
ὅν ὅταν πίνη γεραιός,
τρομεροῦς ποσὶν χορεύει,
πολλὰς τρίχας τινάσσων.

On others of the company the effects of the unfermented grape-juice are still more surprising ;

μετὰ γὰρ νέων ὁ Βάκχος
μεθύων ἄρακτα παίζει.

After this, our readers will feel that we need not pursue Dr. Kerr's classical quotations further, and indeed he has, in reality, disqualified himself, on his own admission, for dealing with the matter ; for he prefaces some sixty pages, out of which a summary of facts is evolved on p. 89, with the following statement of 'Cyrus Redding' :—'The knowledge of the essential properties of the ancient wines is a sealed book for ever' (p. 21).

We pass now, and more seriously, to the consideration of the New Testament use of *οἶνος*. We have, we think, shown that Dr. Kerr's line of argument will not, in reality, meet sceptical objections ; that his estimate of the valuelessness of alcoholic liquor from a dietetic and medicinal point of view must be considerably qualified ; that the effort to duplicate a meaning for *yayin*, and to show the non-intoxicating character of *thrôsh* cannot be sustained ; and that the evidence produced to show that *οἶνος*, or *vinum*, may be applied to unfermented liquor breaks down. The question, therefore, of the New Testament use of *οἶνος* may be argued simply upon its own merits.

In order to avoid any suspicion of evading difficulties we will, in translating, use the Revised Version. The *Temperance Bible Commentary* had been already published before the Revisers began their labours in June 1870 ; some of the most influential members of the Company are, we believe, total abstainers ; and we will not doubt that, in the Jerusalem Chamber, the scholarship of Dr. F. R. Lees and the Rev. Dawson Burns received the attention which is its due.¹ To the

¹ Among the Revisers it should be remembered are the Bishop of Durham, who, in an excellent speech at Cambridge, October 1881, said : 'I come before you to-day as a teetotaler,' and the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, whose zeal and energy as a total abstainer are well known. See *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, May 18, 1878.

'Temperance World' the results of the revision are not unsatisfactory; for Dr. Valpy French, who deems it 'unquestionable that wine, both fermented and unfermented, is contemplated in the writings of the New Testament,'¹ considers that, 'regarding it as a whole, impartiality characterizes the work.' The passage on which, perhaps, the greatest stress is laid, both by Dr. Kerr (p. 101) and Canon Hopkins (*Holy Scripture and Temperance*, p. 42), is S. Matthew ix. 17, with the parallel report of S. Luke v. 37-39. 'Neither do men put new wine into old wine-skins: else the skins burst, and the wine is spilled, and the skins perish: but they put new wine into fresh wine-skins, and both are preserved.' 'What, then,' asks Canon Hopkins, who 'is indebted to Dr. Kerr's *Unfermented Wine: a Fact* for the facts and scientific data upon which his argument is built up,' 'was this wine which would be safely preserved in new bottles, but would ferment and cause old bottles to burst? The only answer is that it was wine, the juice of the grape, which was as yet *unfermented*, and contained no alcohol whatever!' Now, in reference to this statement, we may remark that,

1. There is an assumption which scarcely entitles Canon Hopkins to Dr. Kerr's encomium as 'one of the most judicious theologians of the Church of England.' The term *ὁ νέος οἶνος, ὁ παλαιός* used quite generally as a sort of proverbial saying, is arbitrarily regarded by Canon Hopkins as equivalent to *ἀεὶ γλεῦκος*, or *semper mustum*.

2. There is no proof whatever that there was any intention of preventing fermentation in the fresh wine-skins.

3. As 'the unfermented wine,' on Dr. Kerr's own admission, 'meets with organic *débris* from the previous contents, and, by the enormous force evolved during fermentation, bursts the skins,' the statement implies that all the wine preserved in skin-bags must have been fermented, otherwise the organic *débris* would not have been deposited, nor would it have been necessary to provide new wine-skins at every succeeding vintage.

4. But, as a matter of fact, the apprehended distension occurred not merely in old wine-skins but in new ones. We read in Job xxxii. 19, 'Behold, my belly is as wine which hath no vent; it is ready to burst like *new* bottles.'²

5. Of 'the old wine' which, in spite of Dr. Kerr's 'scientific data,' Canon Hopkins still describes as *semper mustum* (p. 44), Our Lord, without any comment, announces the

¹ *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, June 4, 1881.

² *Dict. Bible*, iii. 1776.

common, popular, prevailing opinion of his contemporaries, that 'the old is good'—most grateful to the taste of those accustomed to it.

But the fact is, as Mr. Wilson points out, that Our Lord's reference is simply to 'old bottles,' or 'skin-bags,' which had become unfit for use by reason of age ;

'His purpose, evidently, is to illustrate the truth, "In that He saith a new covenant, He hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away" (Heb. viii. 13). The Old Economy had served its purpose in preserving the old wine of the kingdom, but it had now become effete, and must vanish away. The old bottles were worn out in the service, and were too weak to endure the expansive force of the new wine, "for the kingdom of Heaven is like unto leaven" (S. Matt. xiii. 33).'¹

Dean Alford puts the real drift of the whole passage into one sentence: 'The new wine is something too living and strong for so weak a moral frame.'²

We pass on to the miracle at Cana. Dr. Kerr considers that 'the hypothesis that the wine Christ made was unintoxicating invests the miracle with peculiar beauty and force, inasmuch as it represents Him accomplishing in a moment that which takes several months each year—the conversion of the watery sap of the vine into wine in the grape' (p. 25). This is followed by the opinion of S. Chrysostom and others, S. Augustine, Josh. (*sic*) Hall, and Archbishop Trench. We freely confess to some surprise that a writer who 'lays science under tribute to throw a little fresh light on a complex and obscure question' (p. 22) should be so willing to accept an explanation of a miracle which, however beautiful, has notoriously exposed S. John's plain and simple narrative to needless criticism. The miracle becomes no easier or more comprehensible by supposing that we have here only an accelerated process of nature, and, moreover, as Dr. Farrar has noted, '*Nature alone* will never, whatever time you give her, make thirty imperial gallons of wine without at least

¹ *The Wines of the Bible*, p. 180.

² An interpretation precisely similar is given by S. Chrysostom, *Hom. xxx. 5*; Bishop Ellicott, *Lectures on the Church of Christ*, p. 173. Dr. Farrar, *Life of Christ*, vol. i. p. 351, speaks of 'new wine put in all its fresh, fermenting, expansive strength, into old and worn wine-skins.' Archbishop Trench describes it (*Studies &c.*, p. 180) as wine 'not as yet having worn off its fermenting strength.' The same view is taken in an article entitled 'The Testimony of Holy Scripture regarding Fermented Liquors,' by the Rev. Dr. Hayman, *Clergyman's Magazine*, August 1879; and compare Jeremiah xiii. 10-12, on which Our Lord's language may be founded.

ten pounds avoirdupois of carbon.'¹ Professor Westcott is altogether silent. He wisely leaves his readers to accept the fact without inquiring into the method. But, whatever the means by which the miracle was worked, Dr. Kerr cannot claim 'the opinion of Chrysostom and others' in favour of 'the hypothesis that the wine was unintoxicating.' S. Chrysostom answers by anticipation a possible sneer based upon the supposed intoxication of the guests. To S. Augustine, 'water' is the insipidity (*insipientia*) of prophecy, but 'the insipidity is taken away when thou hast passed over to the Lord, and what before was water now becomes wine unto thee.' We scarcely think that preserved grape-juice would have suggested the contrast. The Archbishop of Dublin interprets 'well drunk' not, indeed, of the guests present, but as a general reference to 'the unseemly revels which too often disgraced a marriage.'²

It is perfectly true that we know nothing of the nature of the wine produced by our Lord, but if, as has been already shown, the term *oivos* in ancient times was used only for fermented wine, if unfermented wine was not then a welcome or customary beverage, it is altogether inconsistent not to allow that the wine of Cana possessed all vinous properties. 'Indeed,' adds Dr. Hayman, 'unfermented grape-juice would have required a sustaining miracle to keep it so.'³ With Archdeacon Tattam (p. 17) we are satisfied with the translation 'well drunk' or 'drunk freely,' but no one, without a preconceived theory, could interpret the words of 'the ruler of the feast' as applying to a boiled syrup or jelly which is the only unfermented grape-juice discoverable among the ancients.⁴ When S. John ii. 10 is read in the light of S. Luke v. 37-39, the wine thus commended certainly could not have resembled the 'new wine;' it must then have been like 'the old,' and, as we have seen, the old was certainly fermented. Mr. Wilson gives apposite illustrations from Ecclus. xxxi. 6, 7, and 28, and also various passages from Athenæus (A.D. 230) and Pliny (A.D. 79),⁵ and the known character of Jewish marriage feasts⁶ certainly creates a presumption in favour of the general use on such occasions of the *yayin* which, when used in excess, is indeed 'a mocker' (Prov. xx. 1), but which, when used with self-restraint, 'maketh glad the heart of man' (Ps. civ. 15).

¹ *Life of Christ*, vol. i. p. 169.

² *Chr. Hom. in Joan.* xxii.; *Aug. Hom.* ix. 3; Archbishop Trench, *On the Miracles*, p. 111.

³ *Clergyman's Magazine*, August 1879.

⁴ *The Wines of the Bible*, pp. 114-127, &c.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 106-192.

⁶ Archdeacon Tattam's *Reply*, &c., p. 17.

The question of the fermented character of the wine is not affected whether we believe with Bishop Wordsworth that Our Lord made 120 gallons, or with Dr. Farrar that He made 30;¹ whether with Professor Westcott we think that ἀντλήσατε, with the addition of the emphatic νῦν, is applied most naturally to the continued drawing of water from the well when the stone water-jars had been filled, and then bearing it in smaller vessels to the ruler of the feast,² or whether we accept the ordinary interpretation.

We are not careful to reply to the infidel taunt, 'his ministry commences with the production of fermented liquors, it closes with their sanctification,'³ followed by an insinuation that Our Lord sanctioned excess in the social use of suitable alcoholic beverages. It is enough to say with Archbishop Trench, that 'to excess the Lord would as little have given allowance by His presence as He would have helped it forward by a special wonder-work of His own.'⁴ Dr. Kerr in ch. viii. speaks of the 'ancient preference for diluted wine.' This is perfectly true. To drink wine mingled with water was an almost universal custom, and, as a rule, this is implied when wine is spoken of as being drunk.⁵ If the ἀρχιτρίκλινος in any sense corresponded to the *symposiarchus* of the classics, the mixture of water with the wine would have been one of his chief duties. To speak then, as Dr. Kerr does (p. 25), of the wine at Cana irrespective of its purity, its mixture, and its temperate use, as 'an irritant narcotic poison,' as if it were anhydrous alcohol, or ardent spirit, and then to charge those who accept the Scripture narrative as it stands with placing the God of Revelation in opposition to the God of Nature, is no doubt to give renewed occasion to the old sceptical sneer which S. Chrysostom had to face: but the person who revives it is not the expositor of the miracle as it stands, but the advocate of an extreme theory who regards alcohol in every shape and form as evil. That the Lord did Himself partake without singularity of the usual solid and liquid food is clear from the calumny—flagrantly untrue and unjust—which we only know from His own lips, 'Behold, a gluttonous man and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners' (S. Matt. xi. 19). Dr. Kerr very wisely does not allude to this passage.

¹ *Diocesan Addresses*, 1876, p. 43. *Life of Christ*, i. pp. 166, 169.

² Commentary on S. John, ii. 8.

³ *Westminster Review*, Jan. 1875, quoted by Dr. Kerr, p. 13.

⁴ *On the Miracles*, p. 111.

⁵ See further *The Wines of the Bible*, pp. 135-141.

Whether from 'the little time left him for philological or theological controversy,' or from the want of accuracy and thoroughness which characterizes his book, our author passes but lightly over passages in the Epistles which can only be explained upon the supposition that there were risks in the use of wine such as are the result of immoderate partaking of fermented liquors. He thinks (p. 109), that 'there is no warrant for such an inference' as that in 1 Tim. iii. 8 and Titus ii. 3 'fermented wine' is indicated, because a similar caution is given, Prov. xxv. 27, against 'much honey,' which, as he truly says, 'no one will contend is intoxicating.' 'To be enslaved to grape-jelly' would, we think, have been rather a strong description of aged women who may have been fond of 'the cute,' *sapa*, or *defrutum*, which on the authority of one Parkinson, Dr. Kerr assures us 'helpeth the cough and shortness of breath, and to expectorate rough phlegm from the chest and lungs.' He is of opinion that the injunction to 'bishops' to *βεῖν μὴ πάροιον* (1 Tim. iii. 3, Titus i. 7) seems to involve 'abstention from drinking parties and avoidance of the drinking customs' (p. 110). Doubtless, it forbids the first, and regulates the second, for, in the words of the *Temperance Bible Commentary* (p. 385), 'the profligacy of the Gentile world was boundless, and associated all its excesses with the intoxicating liquors then in use.' But if Dr. Kerr imagines that *μὴ πάροιον* means nothing more than 'not by or near wine,' he has against him the unanimous opinion of the Revisers of the New Testament, of whom the majority translate 'brawlers,' and the minority 'quarrelsome over wine.' Of course, in commenting on Eph. v. 18, *ἐν ᾧ* is made to refer only to *οἶνον*, partly because 'in all narcotics . . . each dose begets a desire for another dose,' and partly because 'the Iman Jumah,' on reading this passage told Mr. J. Usher that 'the Christians disobeyed their own sacred books in drinking the forbidden liquor' (p. 111). So far from this being the case, the riotous excess and prodigality expressed by *ἀσωτία* implies that there was such a thing among the Ephesians as the use of wine in moderation, and such passages as Col. ii. 16, Rom. xiv. 14, and 1 Tim. iv. 4, surely recognize the use of the ordinary drink, *i.e.* wine in some form of it, mixed or neat, as included in the charter of Christian liberty. 'Such language,' Dr. Hayman adds, 'would, at least, have been greatly misleading, had S. Paul held and wished to inculcate that abhorrence of all enjoyment of wine which many modern abstainers freely express.'² The whole drift of the passage

¹ 'Cute' = new wine unworked.² *Clergyman's Magazine*, Aug. 1879.

has led the best commentators to refer ἐν ᾧ to the whole phrase, not to wine only, and even if it did, there is no prohibition of its moderate use. μὴ μεθύσκεσθε is not an expression which could be used of ordinary drinking, but of drunkenness.¹

Of all the explanations 'of the remarkable occurrence narrated in Acts ii. 13-15, none is satisfactory' to Dr. Kerr's mind. As he thinks that 'Gleukos was usually indicative of sweet, unfermented grape-juice,' this is not surprising. But, as S. Peter's reply to the mockers, 'οὐ γὰρ, ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε, οὗτοι μεθύουσιν,' would lead most people naturally to suppose, the γλεῦκος, although sweet, was yet intoxicating. That γλεῦκος was fermented is clear from the fact that it could burst even those 'fresh wine-skins,' of which we have heard so much. In Job xxxii. 19, this is clearly indicated by the LXX: ἡ δὲ γαστήρ μου ὥσπερ ἀσκὸς γλεῦκος ζέων δεδεμένος. Moreover, as Pentecost fell in June, and the earliest vintage was not till August, the wine could not have been new, and wine especially prepared to retain its sweetness was of extra strength.²

Our author will scarcely allow that even the medicinal use of fermented wine is mentioned in the New Testament. Although 'the character of the wine ordered by Paul to Timothy is to us a sealed book,' Dr. Kerr, after adding a number of illustrations of 'medicinal intoxicating wine' and 'medicinal unintoxicating wine,' appears to incline to the opinion that the wine in question was non-alcoholic. The context in which the passage occurs (1 Tim. v. 23) shows that Timothy, in the midst of his difficult duties as bishop in Ephesus, required some slight use of a stimulant, such as Dr. Clark allows to persons in 'a secondary sort of health.' Either from an ascetic tendency, or as an example to luxurious Greeks, Timothy had been an ὑδροπότης, and now, that he might be better fitted to do his special work, S. Paul gives a prescription which, if right for Timothy, is right for anyone else under similar circumstances.

Dr. Kerr's arguments in 'the region of exegetical and philological speculation' are, we think, now fairly disposed of, and we can accordingly estimate on its own merits his statement about the wine used by Our Blessed Lord in the insti-

¹ See Chrys. *Hom.* xix. in *Eph.* 'How then,' he asks, contrasting the passage with Prov. xxxi. 6 (LXX) and Ps. civ. 15, 'does wine produce drunkenness? For it cannot be that one and the same thing should work contradictions. Drunkenness then surely does not arise from wine, but from intemperance.'

² Bishop Jacobson, *Speaker's Commentary*, I.c. *Dict. Bible*, iii. 1777.

tution of the Holy Eucharist. He disposes of the question in eight lines, followed by some 'weighty words of the Dean of Carlisle, 1861,' and seems to suggest that the matter is settled in the following paragraph, which, like the quotation from Dr. Close, contains no solid reasoning one way or the other:—

'As to the wine used by our Lord at the Last Supper, the original, γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, *geneematos tees ampelou*, gives no countenance to the idea that the liquid was intoxicating. Unfermented grape juice can truly be called "the fruit of the vine," but after fermentation the nature of the liquid is completely changed. From an innocent, nourishing drink, it is converted into a beverage with poisonous properties.'

It is argued that if our Lord had used fermented wine, He would not have used the expression ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου,¹ but simply οἶνος. But periphrastic expressions of this kind are, it is needless to say, perfectly common. Pindar calls wine ἀμπέλου παῖς, *N. ix. 124*, and Euripides speaks of the vine as the mother of wine;

πίνει μελαίνης μητρὸς εὐζωρον μέθυ. *Alc. 757.*

But the real reason for Our Lord's use of the term is almost certainly to be found in the fact that it occurs in the Passover ritual and also in the Sabbath Eve service of the Synagogue. In the 'Consecration,' which was sung by the reader in the Synagogue as he held in his right hand a cup of wine, and which was said at the Passover by the master of the family and the rest in concert, the following words occur: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord God, King of the world, who hast created the fruit of the vine.'²

Τὸ γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου is then equivalent to οἶνος, but it is argued that this could not have been fermented, because of the general prohibition against leaven (*Exod. xii. 15*); but in the Pentateuch, as is well known, there is no mention of wine in the laws connected with the Passover as it was originally instituted. It was introduced at a subsequent date, and the Mishnah strictly enjoins that there should never be less than four cups of it provided at the Paschal meal even of the poorest Israelite³ (*Pes. x. 1*). Hence, against the use of fer-

¹ In *S. Matt. xxvi. 29*, of the third cup—"the cup of blessing"—which He consecrated, and in *S. Luke xxii. 18* of the first cup.

² *Jewish Services, Pedahzur*, p. 51, quoted by Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, ii. 294.

³ For an answer to an objection based on the unproved assumption that 'each person' had to drink two-and-a-half pints of wine at the Passover, and, therefore, ran grave risk of intoxication if the wine was fermented, see Wilson, *Wines of the Bible*, pp. 351-353.

mented wine there was no Levitical prohibition; and, as Dr. Edersheim has recently said, in a letter published in the *Guardian* of September 20, 1882, the principle is distinctly laid down in the Talmud (*Pes.* 40 a, line 8 from top) 'that the juice of fruits does not produce leavening.' So, too, Lightfoot observes: 'Diserto mandato tenebantur ad comestionem panis azymi hoc tempore, Exod. xviii., sed potum vini adjecerunt generali principio nixi: *Quia oportebat virum laute excipere uxorem et liberos, ut in hoc convivio hilares essent. Qua autem re eos exilarabat? Vino.*'¹ Moreover, it is not true that all fermented substances were excluded from the Passover, because it is certain that the *Charoseth* contained vinegar, the formation of which is accompanied by 'the acetous fermentation.'² 'Habebant etiam patinam,' says Lightfoot, 'cujus crassum erat condimentum, quam vocabant *Charoseth*, plenam dulcibus et amaris cibis, ut dactylis, ficibus, uvis, aceto, &c.' Not only so, but, if the 'unfermented theory' be correct, Our Lord deliberately broke the law upon the Cross. S. John distinctly states (ch. xix. 29, 30) that after the fifth saying, 'I thirst,' He received 'the vinegar' (τὸ ὄξος), and that unmixed. The idea that the Passover wine was unfermented probably arose from the fact that the greatest care was taken to prevent any artificial fermentation such as would arise from the presence in the liquor of any grains of wheat, so that there might be nothing but the true vinous fermentation.³

Again, the wine of the Passover was mixed with water as it was drunk. 'In hisce quatuor vini calicibus sedulo observabant certam quandam mensuram et mixturam,' are Lightfoot's words (*Opera*, i. p. 735). This, on the authority of Dr. Edersheim, Archdeacon Tattam, who quotes from *Pes.* cap. 7, 13, and cap. 10, 1, and the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Adler,⁴ was

¹ *Opera*, i. p. 735.

² Dr. Kerr, *Wines* &c., p. 30.

³ Dr. Edersheim (*Guardian*, Sept. 20, 1882) adds that in the *Mishnah* (*Pes.* iii. 1) 'among the things by which the Paschal regulations are infringed is mentioned *chometz havedomi*, "Edomite vinegar," which seems to have been a kind of wine in which fermentation was produced (or increased) by putting in barley; and this seems at one time to have been done with some sort of wine in Judæa (see *Pes.* 42 b, line 7 &c. from top); and such wine, but not that by natural fermentation, would, of course, be interdicted.' This illustrates a remark made in the article, 'The Scriptural View of Wine and Strong Drink,' viz., 'that the simple and natural effect of the atmosphere on the juice of the grape could not be viewed as having, for the purpose of the legislator, anything akin to the insertion of leaven into a lump of dough, even assuming that the knowledge existed of their identity in physical principle.'—*Ch. Quart. Rev.*, January 1879, p. 47.

⁴ See *Holy Scripture and Temperance*, by Canon Hopkins, p. 93.

done in order to *avoid intoxication*, and as it was the ordinary custom in drinking wine to do this, Lightfoot's explanation, given on the authority of Maimonides, that it was done 'ut vinum gratius redderent,' is no contradiction. Dr. Edersheim says that the ordinary proportion was two parts of water to one of wine, though strong wine was mixed in that of three parts of water to one of wine. And, finally, to prove this practice, in the *Mishnah* (*Pes. vii. 13*) it is directed that if two companies eat (the Paschal Supper) in the same place, the one turns its face to the one side, the other to the other, 'and the kettle' (for mixing the wine with water) 'stands between them.' The use of the kettle, it may be well to observe, although an apology is almost needed for even an allusion to so absurd an argument, by no means proves that the diluted wine was nothing but dissolved grape-jelly, for wine mixed with hot water was everywhere a favourite beverage.¹

Further, intoxication was possible. 'In *Jer. Pesach*, 37 d, line 23 from bottom,' says Dr. Edersheim, 'the direction of the *Mishnah* (*Pes. x. 6*) to the effect that it was lawful to drink between the first and second, but not between the third and fourth, Paschal cups,' is explained, 'this for fear of becoming drunken;' it being added 'that such was not to be apprehended in regard to drinking between the first and second cups, since the wine which was drunk while people ate rarely intoxicated, but it was otherwise with wine drunk after food.' He also states that in *Jer. Pes. p. 37 c, &c.*, a number of instances are given in which certain Rabbis (who are named) suffered in consequence of the intoxicating nature of the Passover wine.

But Canon Hopkins has enabled us to add the testimony of a witness who, in consequence of his high position and devoted services to the Jewish community, can scarcely be regarded among the number of those who are described by the Rev. William Caine as men who 'transgress the commandments of God' by using fermented wine at the Passover. Canon Hopkins appealed to the Chief Rabbi to ascertain 'what might be known respecting the practice of the Jews in modern times;' for, as he truly observes, 'it is well known that they are strongly conservative in their traditions, and unwilling to meddle with those that are given to change.' We subjoin in full the copy of the Rev. Dr. Adler's reply:²

¹ Wilson, *Wines of the Bible*, pp. 352-353.

² *Holy Scripture and Temperance*, p. 93.

Office of the Chief Rabbi, 16 Finsbury Square, London,
 March 23, ⁵⁶³⁹_{1879.}

'Rev. Sir,—I willingly reply to the question you have addressed to me in your favour of the 18th instant.

'1. There is no precept whatever bidding us use other than fermented wine for the Passover and other religious ceremonies. The prohibitions relating to leaven are taken by all our interpreters to apply only to the fermentation of grain, and flour produced from it.

'2. Such wine is prepared in the usual way. From the notices in the *Talmud*, however, it is apparent that the wine was invariably mixed with water, so as to prevent its having an intoxicating effect. Nor was the wine partaken of in sufficient quantity to induce excess. I need not point out to you the numerous prohibitions of intemperance in the Bible, more especially in the Proverbs. . . .

'I remain, yours faithfully,

'N. ADLER, DR.'

The testimony of Dr. Kalisch as to the quality of the wine is precisely the same,¹ and against such evidence we venture to say that some vague rumours about the use of 'unfermented wine—wine simply made from raisins' (p. 94)—by 'the more orthodox and bigoted Jews in Poland and Russia,' are of no value at all, especially as the real cause of that usage is probably their poverty, and consequent inability to procure the purest wine.

One more argument might be adduced. The vintage occurred in September, the Passover was not celebrated until eight months after. Our readers are already in possession of facts, from this and a previous article, which show that the modern scientific processes of arresting fermentation for so long a period were then unknown; and therefore it follows that even if the arguments just adduced could in any point be weakened, the fact remains that the Passover cup—the cup described by our Lord 'as the fruit of the vine'—the cup of which He said, 'This is My Blood of the Covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins,' must have contained fermented wine, simply because it could contain no other. Not merely now, in symbol, but in reality, the apostles were a band of orphans (S. John xiv. 10). And in their desolation, although in a sense far deeper than ever had been possible before, was the command fulfilled, 'Give . . . wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink, and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more.'² The whole

¹ Quoted by 'Sollicitus,' *Guardian*, September 20, 1882.

² Prov. xxxi. 6, 7. See Archdeacon Freeman's *Principles of Divine Service*, ii. p. 306.

argument establishes the conclusion which we are permitted to state in words written to a friend by Dr. Pusey in 1879: 'There is no doubt that the wine of Holy Scripture was fermented. It is certain that there was a custom of mingling water with wine at the Paschal feast, when Our Lord instituted the Holy Eucharist.'

In connexion with the quality of the wine used at the institution of the Holy Communion, the account of the Corinthian abuse of the Agape and the Eucharist occasions serious perplexity to the defenders of 'the unfermented wine theory.' It has been no doubt a grievous disappointment 'to the students of the Bible wine question, who are searching in hope that they may find their theories or beliefs based upon a more unquestionable testimony,'¹ that the Revisers, without any hesitation or apparent difference of opinion, translated 1 Cor. xi. 21, 'for in your eating each one taketh before *other* his own supper, and one is hungry, and another is drunken.' The wine was clearly ordinary wine, *i.e.* intoxicating, and although the reference in this verse is probably to excess at the love-feast which up to that time had been chiefly connected with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, no reasonable person can suppose that the wine used at the one differed in quality from the wine used at the other. Although in a passage like S. John ii. 11, *μεθύειν* may be used to designate large drinking (without intoxication), there must be good reason, either from the context or the circumstances of the speaker, to give it an interpretation different from its ordinary meaning, expressing with its kindred *μέθη*, *μεθύσκει*, and *μέθυσος*, the notion of intoxication.² *μεθύειν* is not the exact opposite of *πεινᾶν*,³ but, as Meyer remarks, 'it makes the picture all the fuller and more vivid, because *πεινᾶ* and *μεθύει* lead the reader in both cases to imagine for himself the other extreme corresponding to the one specified.'⁴ 'Paul,' he adds, 'paints the scene in *strong* colours; but who would be warranted in saying that the reality fell at all short of the description?' The poor man fasts till he is hungry, the rich man feasts till he is drunken. Dr. Kerr, who does not

¹ Dr. Valpy French, *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, 1881, p. 362.

² See S. Matt. xxiv. 49; Acts ii. 15; 1 Thess. v. 7. Among the Corinthian Christians some were at least in danger of becoming *μέθυοι*, 1 Cor. vi. 11. Cf. LXX, Prov. xxiii. 21; xxvi. 9, &c.

³ The opposite is *χορταίνεσθαι*: Bishop Lightfoot, Philipp. iv. 12. If S. Paul had intended to say 'quite full,' he would have employed this word, which has that meaning.

⁴ Meyer's *Commentary on 1 Cor.* vol. i. p. 336.

understand that the passage (vv. 17-34) refers to the Agape as well as to the Eucharist, thinks that the words, 'Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, wait one for another,' is not commensurate with the heinousness of the sin 'of intoxication at the table of the Lord' (p. 106). Doubtless it would have been an altogether inadequate admonition; but the fact is that something more than 'an apostolic injunction' had already been pronounced in reference to that part of the Corinthian offence (vv. 27-32), and the sentence in v. 33 applies to their excess at the Agape, which S. Paul describes as *Κυριακὸν δείπνον*, 'a meal belonging to the Lord.' The wine, then, employed at Corinth, both at the Eucharist and Agape, was clearly intoxicating, and is it likely that within thirty years of the institution of the Sacrament it would have been so, if the Passover cup had been unfermented? S. Paul had received his account of the institution of the Eucharist, like the Gospel generally, in the way of authentic revelation from Christ. If, indeed, 'the smallest sip of the weakest form of an intoxicating liquor' *would* have endangered the safety of the penitent and believing among these Corinthian communicants, who may have been *μέθυστοι* in former days (1 Cor. vi. 10, 11), is it credible that Our Lord would not have warned S. Paul against possible risks to the souls whom He came to save? But it was not so; it was not in the alcohol, but in the souls of irreverent and unbelieving communicants, that the danger really lay.²

Dr. Kerr proceeds from Scripture to Church history. In a chapter headed 'Communion in Unfermented Wine at all Periods of the Church's History,' he remarks: 'There need be no difficulty. We have evidence of the use of unfermented wine in the very infancy of the Christian Church' (p. 136). The editors of the *Temperance Bible Commentary* are even more confident. They assure us that 'hardly any Church but the corrupted, intolerant, and persecuting Churches of the West ever introduced any other practice than that of the abstainer' (p. 201).

Our readers will look with some curiosity for 'the evidence' on which so sweeping a statement is based. We have already seen that S. Paul, whose life synchronized with 'the

¹ Dr. Kerr, *Wines &c.*, p. 121.

² That *μέθυστοι* implies intoxication is the opinion of S. Chrysostom, Dean Alford, Professor Evans (*Speaker's Commentary of New Testament*, vol. ii.), Meyer, Bishop Wordsworth. The Vulgate translation is 'ebrius est.' See also, in regard to the Agape and the Eucharist, Suicer, *The-saurus*, p. 23, and Dean Plumptre's article, 'Lord's Supper,' *Dict. Bible*, ii. 142.

very
tion
out
ther
neū
men
accu
for s
the
five

incio
Mat
Plat
rpic
appr
thre
(Tis
Mar

'Ac
trac
been
wor
writ
cent
cust
Scr
wel
Euc
By
been
far
Ma
eccl
the
best

vinc
Aqu
Co's
Win
Apo
136
Gos

very infancy of the Christian Church,' had to deal with questions in connexion with Eucharist and Agape which arose out of the use of wine certainly not unfermented. We await then the evidence of Justin Martyr, of Tertullian, of S. Irenæus; but so far as Dr. Kerr and the *Temperance Bible Commentary* are concerned, we wait in vain. It is not to these accustomed sources that the unfermented wine theory looks for support, but to others less familiar, but, it may be, none the less convincing, even if the number of witnesses in the first five centuries should be but two. The first is anonymous:—

'A.D. 200. The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles (2nd century) incidentally testify to this practice. In the *Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew* these words are narrated as having been addressed to Bishop Plato: "καὶ προσεέγκατε προσφοράν ἄρτον ἁγίων, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμπέλου τρεῖς βότρυας ἀποθλίψαντες ἐν ποτηρίῳ συγκοινωνήσατέ μοι."—"And approach with an offering of holy bread, and having pressed out three clusters from the vine into a cup, communicate with me"' (Tischendorf, *Acta Apostol. Apocr.*, p. 184, Leipsiæ, 1851. *Acta et Martyrium Matthæi*).¹

We do not suppose that Dr. Kerr knows more of the 'Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew' than appears in this extract. Had he gone to the original he would perhaps have been less confident in producing this bit of evidence from a work which is nothing but a romantic creation of fancy, written at an uncertain date between the second and third centuries, in order to diffuse and support the doctrines and customs of the various Gnostic schools, among whom *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical*, would have met with a cordial welcome. Tatian used pure water instead of wine at the Eucharist; his followers bore the name of *Hydroparastatæ*. By Encratites and Marcionites intoxicating liquors would have been denounced with as much fervour as by Dr. Kerr, and so far as the very doubtful production known as *The Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew* can be cited at all as an evidence of ecclesiastical usage, the customs it describes are not those of the Christian Church, but of that subtle heresy which did its best to ruin the cause of the Gospel altogether.²

¹ *Wines &c.*, p. 136. That this evidence is regarded as very convincing is shown by the fact that with testimonies from S. Thomas Aquinas, Dr. Close, Rabbi Manasseh Ben Israel, &c., and Gilbey and Co.'s Annual Circular, it appears in advertisements of 'Unfermented Wines.'

² See Dr. Smith's *Dict. Christian Biogr.* vol. i., article 'Acts of the Apostles' (Apocryphal), pp. 20, 29; Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies*, pp. 136, 137, and *The Acts and Martyrdom of S. Matthew, Apocryphal Gospels*, &c., pp. 304-5 (T. and T. Clark).

The anonymous witness, 'A voice' heard by 'Bishop Plato' just before that prelate saw 'Matthew standing on the sea,' although his body had been put into an iron coffin, sealed up with lead, and thrown into the depths of ocean, is, we think, silenced in regard to the use of unfermented grape-juice in the Eucharistic cup in the infant Church. For our second witness we have to wait for over another century. At last, A.D. 337, Dr. Kerr produces him and, strange to say, from the Western Church. In a note which bristles with references to many recondite authorities, Gratian, Labbé (*sic*), and Durandus, a decree of Pope Julius I. is presented to our notice. Whether or not the *Corpus Juris Canonici* has been included among the 5,000 volumes read by our author with reference to the Scripture wine question we cannot say, but had he referred to Richter's edition (Leipsic, 1839) he would have perceived the following note: 'Eadem fere habentur nunc in Bracarense 3, c. 1;' and had he also referred here, as he appears to have done elsewhere, to 'the excellent contributions of Scudamore,' he would have discovered that a council was held at Braga, as, indeed, he informs us himself under 'seventh century,' in A.D. 675. It is true that the words upon which he sets so much store, 'si necesse sit, botrus in calice comprimatur et aqua misceatur,' do not occur in the Decree of Braga, but it is at least equally improbable that they are due to Pope Julius I. The fact is that our author has been quoting one of the spurious decretals, and innocently assigning it to 'the very infancy of the Christian Church.'

Thus, then, 'Pope Julius I.' is no more substantial a witness than 'the voice,' and, therefore, we are left with only one piece of evidence of the use of unfermented wine in the Christian Church up to the seventh century, and that is Dr. Kerr's own assertion.

We will, however, supply the absence of Dr. Kerr's witnesses by some others who are better known. Here are a few which describe the general feeling of the infant Christian Church with regard to persons who, on grounds purely ascetic, or for fear of contamination with matter, abstained from using certain kinds of food. In Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 3, the Churches of Vienne and Lyons say in their Epistle concerning the Martyrs, A.D. 177:—

'That when one of that number, Alcibiades, practised austerity, living on bread and water, and continued to do so in prison after his first conflict with wild beasts in the amphitheatre, it was revealed in a vision to Attalus that Alcibiades did not well in not making use of God's creatures, and in giving an *example of scandal to others*; and

that
creat

It n
a su
Can
or t

num
for t
ting
and
him
from

The
26,
467

wine
eith
the
the
Mar
win
says
wat
of

doe
des
' Th
drin
plyi
abl
Cæ
pers
wat
mix
Ps.
how
sure
one
anc
wat

that after this Alcibiades changed his diet, and received God's creatures with thankfulness.'

It may be presumed that he had abstained from them on a supposition that they were evil. In the so-called Apostolic Canons, the 51st, considered by Hefele to date from the second or third century, runs thus:—

'If any bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, or generally any of the number of the clergy, abstain from marriage, and flesh, and wine, not for the sake of discipline, but on account of detestation of it, forgetting that all things are very good, and that God made man male and female, but blasphemously pronounces censure on creation, let him either submit to correction or be deposed and excommunicated from the Church. And a layman likewise.'¹

The language of the Apostolic Constitutions, i. vi. c. 8, 10, 26, and of S. Chrysostom, as quoted by Suicer, *Thesaurus*, p. 467, is precisely similar.

In the infancy of the Christian Church, then, fermented wine was clearly not regarded with abhorrence as in itself either a demon or a poison, and, therefore, 'the practice of the abstainer' was not the practice of primitive Christians in the administration and reception of the Eucharist. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 65) speaks of the mixing of water with the wine as universal; 'to each of those who are present,' he says, 'a portion of the Eucharistic bread, and wine, and water' are given. S. Irenæus (*Adv. Hæres.* v. ii. 3) speaks of 'the cup which is mingled.' S. Clement of Alexandria does the same (*Paedag.* i. ii. c. 2). Tertullian (*Apol.* i. 39), in describing the Agapæ, implies the use of intoxicating wine. 'They eat,' he says, 'as much as hungry men desire; they drink as much as is profitable for chaste men,' clearly implying that the liquid drunk might in excess become unprofitable. The whole argument of S. Cyprian in his letter to Cæcilius (*Ep.* 63, ed. Bened.), written for the sake of some persons who through ignorance received the Sacrament in water, turns upon the intoxicating character of the wine mixed with which the cup should be offered. Quoting from Ps. xxiii. 5, as LXX translate² it, 'Thy inebriating cup how good is it,' he says, 'But the cup that inebriateth must surely be mixed with wine. For water cannot inebriate any one.' Patristic testimony is confirmed by the evidence of the ancient liturgies, which either contain a direction for mixing water with the wine, or else in the canon the mixing is re-

¹ Hefele, *Hist. of the Christian Councils*, vol. i. p. 479.

² So too the Vulgate, 'calix meus inebrians quam præclarus est.'

ferred to.¹ So also in the third of the Apostolical Canons, the substance of which Hefele pronounces very ancient,² the penalty of deposition is held over a clergyman who should celebrate in anything but *olivos*. The fact that the Manichæans rejected the cup of the Holy Communion proves that the wine there used was of an intoxicating nature.

'The Manichæans,' says Bishop Wordsworth, 'did not reject the juice of the grape, but they condemned wine. In the words of S. Augustine,³ "What perverseness is it, to feel no scruple as to grapes, and yet to call wine the gall of the Prince of Darkness?" And again, "They regard it as a sacrilege to touch wine, as if it were a creature of the Evil One, and therefore an impure thing, although they willingly taste the fruit of the vine."⁴

'And therefore when they came to the Holy Communion they made a feint of drinking the wine from the consecrated cup, but they secretly ejected it from their mouths.'⁵

These instances, all within the first five centuries, will, perhaps, suffice to show what the judgment of the Church in its 'very infancy' would have been in regard to the question of Communion in unfermented wine. In Churches Eastern as well as Western the custom was the same, and certainly that custom was not 'the practice of the abstainer.'

With regard to Dr. Kerr's mediæval authorities, mainly extracted from Scudamore, one or two general observations will suffice, but it may be worth while to examine a little narrowly a statement which implies that 'Communion in unfermented wine' would have met with the cordial approval of 'the Angelican (*sic*) Doctor.' The editors of the *Temperance Bible Commentary*, from whom Dr. Kerr derives his erudition (pp. 139, 140), inform us that, in reply to the question, 'Utrum vinum vitis sit propria materia hujus sacramenti?' S. Thomas replies, 'Mustum autem jam habet speciem vini,' 'grape-juice has the specific nature of wine;' and decides, 'Ideo de musto potest confici hoc sacramentum,—' Therefore this Sacrament can be kept (*sic*) with grape-juice.' The intention, no doubt, of this appeal to scholastic theology is to gain the support of persons in whose eyes the traditions of the Western Church are not wholly valueless, and for the benefit of such Canon Hopkins (*Holy Scripture and Temperance*, p. 95) adds the remarkable fact, for which no authority is given, that 'Popes

¹ *Dict. Christian Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 604.

² Vol. i. p. 358.

³ *De Moribus Manichæorum*, sect. 44, vol. i. p. 1182, ed. Paris.

⁴ *De Hæresibus*, sect. 46, vol. viii. p. 51.

⁵ *Diocesan Addresses*, 1876, p. 45.

have permitted the use even of milk in countries where wine could not be obtained.' The ordinary reader would understand that the authority of the *Summa* may be pleaded in favour of leaving the character of the wine of the Eucharist an open question, and as we fear that, even in some quarters where considerations based upon ecclesiastical usage may be treated with respect, 'unfermented wine' is regarded with favour, we feel bound to expose the sophistry, for no other word can be used, with which a sentence or two from S. Thomas, detached from their context, are made to sanction this serious innovation.¹ So far from doing anything of the kind, S. Thomas begins by affirming that *vinum vitis* is proper matter of the Sacrament. 'Respondeo dicendum, quod de solo vino vitis potest confici hoc sacramentum.'² He grounds this reply upon the institution of Christ, Who 'in vino vitis hoc sacramentum instituit,' and adds that fluids made from other fruits (*alii liquores*) are only called wine from a certain likeness to *vinum vitis*. He then refers to 'vinum lætificat cor hominis,' saying that 'vinum vitis magis competit ad effectum hujus sacramenti, qui est spiritualis lætitia,' just as S. Cyprian, in his letter to Cæcilius, had spoken of the 'calix inebrians.' After pointing out that the Sacrament may not be celebrated with wine in process of becoming vinegar, nor yet with 'agresta,' because it is 'in via generationis: et ideo nondum habet speciem vini,'³ he says that 'mustum' may be used 'in necessitate,' but this passage, taken as a whole, leads to a conclusion altogether different to that which Dr. Kerr, and the Editors of the *Temperance Bible Commentary*, would desire us to infer.

'Mustum autem jam habet speciem vini, nam ejus dulcedo attestatur digestionem, quæ est completio a naturali calore: . . . et ideo de musto potest confici hoc sacramentum. Non tamen debent uvæ integræ huic sacramento misceri: quia jam esset ibi aliquid præter vinum. Prohibetur etiam ne mustum statim expressum de uva, in calice offeratur: quia hoc est indecens propter impuritatem musti. Potest tamen in necessitate fieri, dicitur enim ab eodem Julio Papa, si necesse fuerit botrus in calicem prematur.'

If, on the one hand, *agresta* was invalid matter because it was 'in via generationis'; if, on the other, *mustum* was something which 'jam habet speciem vini'; if, moreover, mention is

¹ A sentence from the *Summa* forms the first of a series of 'illustrative excerpts' in a circular containing 'over 100 testimonials in favour of the use of unfermented wine.'

² *Summa*, iii. 74, 75.

³ Explained by Ducange 'Omphacium, *Verjus*.'

made of its 'naturalis calor,' then S. Thomas' language amply justifies Mr. Scudamore's description, 'the fermented juice before it is refined.'¹ As fermentation is a natural process,² it can only be stopped, as we learn from the numerous circulars of Mr. Frank Wright, manufacturing chemist, by artificial processes which destroy the germs of fermentation. Not only is the grape juice raised to a temperature of 190° immediately on being squeezed out, and poured off into bottles at once hermetically sealed, but as fermentation is possible even after these elaborate preventive measures have been taken, when the cork is withdrawn, 'a minute portion of a perfectly innocent antiseptic' is added, which is stated to preserve 'the wine' from fermentation under all circumstances. As the fluid is not, and never can become wine, it is altogether different from the *mustum* of S. Thomas, or even the newly expressed grape juice of Pope Julius, and is, therefore, invalid matter for consecration.

The remainder of Dr. Kerr's instances of the use of the juice of grapes, or the liquor squeezed out of raisins, taken from Mr. Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, are equally inconclusive. These practices were, as Mr. Scudamore himself describes them, 'expedients in scarcity.' So far from being the rule, such expedients were the exception, and in the single instance to which the reason of scarcity would not apply—namely, a practice of Communion in juice expressed out of the ripe grape on August 6, the festival of the Transfiguration, the day on which new grapes were offered in the Mass—the liquor would be already inchoate wine, like the 'mustum' of S. Thomas. Considered as a whole, the language of Mr. Scudamore does not lend the slightest support to the use of 'unfermented wine' in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in this country, or in any other where alcoholic wine can be obtained. Dr. Kerr (p. 144), taking an isolated sentence in the *Notitia Eucharistica* (2nd edition, p. 885), apart from the whole section in which it occurs, claims one of the most reverent and Catholic-minded of English clergymen as his ally.³ Mr. Scudamore can no longer speak for himself, but

¹ *Notitia Eucharistica*, 2nd edit., p. 283.

² 'It is well known that alcoholic fermentation is due to the presence of a minute fungus, the yeast fungus, the living protoplasm of whose cells have the property of separating solution of sugar into alcohol, which remains in the liquid, and carbonic acid, which escapes into the air.'—*Address of Dr. Allman*, British Association, August 20, 1879.

³ In the *Notitia Eucharistica* (p. 883) Mr. Scudamore wrote, 'In a case of necessity the expressed juice of grapes has always been held to be wine for the purpose of the Sacrament.' Pp. 883-885 distinctly show that

we are enabled to state, on authority too high to be questioned, that Dr. Kerr 'has clearly attributed to him opinions that he never advocated either in his writings or, as far as is known, by anything he ever said in his lifetime.'

Little more remains to be said. For instructed and believing Churchmen the proceedings of the 'General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Organization in America,' or of 'the Free and United Presbyterian Bodies in Scotland,' or of 'English Presbyterians,' or 'of Congregationalists, Baptists, &c.,' or even the 'Established Church of Scotland,' or 'the Mildmay Conference,' or the opinion of one 'Johannes Marck, Amst., 1722,' who, in Dr. Kerr's eyes, represents 'the Reformers' rolled into one, have, in a matter of this kind, the slightest interest, except so far as they exhibit the carelessness in regard to the administration of the Sacraments which seems to be the sure result of self-constituted ministries. The answer to the opinion of 'the well-known ecclesiastical lawyer, Dr. A. J. Stephens, Q.C.' (quoted by Dr. Kerr, p. 148) has already been given in the foregoing pages. Our readers can judge for themselves of the value of an 'opinion' which begins by saying 'that there is no evidence to show whether "the fruit of the vine" our Saviour administered at the Last Supper was "unfermented" or "fermented;"' and if it be urged that there are no decrees of Councils against the use of the unfermented liquor, the simple reply is that the practice is so entirely novel, that save in cases of scarcity it has never been seriously entertained in any part of the Catholic Church, and, therefore, did not require Synodical attention. But the Church's action in the Manichæan controversies in the fourth century, and the treatment of the Manichæan sects which arose at the beginning of the middle ages, indicate clearly enough what the verdict would have been if the question had been raised among the Orthodox.

In his appeal to the bishops and clergy to treat the use of unfermented wine at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist as an open question, Dr. Kerr asks 'whether any custom can be wholly in accordance with the teaching and character of Christ, which in the days of widespread and hereditary alcoholism is unsafe for the weakest of those for whom He died' (p. 150). We reply that if the Son of God in His

such a necessity was scarcity of 'vinum vitis' in the ordinary acceptance of the term. Dr. Kerr represents him as saying, 'In the case of necessity, the expressed juice has always, &c.' There is no reference to the general principle of using 'expressed juice' any more than there is in the passage of Durandus quoted by Dr. Kerr (p. 137).

wisdom and omniscience used, as we claim to have shown, alcoholic wine at the institution of the Sacrament, we dare not alter the matter which He chose to be the means of conveying His Sacramental gifts to the members of His mystical body. Fermentation is a natural process; a liquid in which it is *prevented* by artificial means ceases to be in any true sense wine; and the Sacrament can be no more celebrated with such a fluid than it can be celebrated with water, according to Gnostic or Manichæan usage, or with the liquid of the cocoanut actually used by missionaries connected with the London Missionary Society in their 'love-feasts,' for they are nothing else, in the islands of the South Sea. With Dr. Kerr's views about the Holy Eucharist we are not concerned (see p. 133), but no one who believes in the reality of Sacramental grace can doubt for one moment that in the faithful use of the cup of salvation our Lord will shield His own redeemed from any possible harm.

Dr. Kerr uses himself, or else quotes from speeches or writings of a few other physicians, language in regard to the reception of the chalice by 'reformed drunkards' which we will not repeat. (See pp. 126, 128, 133-134, 150-153.) He tells us that—

'Not a few victims, saved through abstinence from this vice, and crime, and sin have, after manfully resisting the temptations of the world for years, been tempted again to ruin by partaking of alcoholic wine at the Holy Communion, *in which they had with difficulty been persuaded to join by an unenlightened, though zealous Christian minister*' (p. 123).

In illustration of this he gives an instance (pp. 123-125) of the relapse of 'a Christian worker, B.,' once a drunkard, who had been appointed 'to the responsible post of Scripture reader to S. —'s church,' but who in fear of 'partaking of ever so small a quantity of intoxicating liquor,' refused to receive the Holy Eucharist. A., 'with whom B. was closely allied in all Church fellowship except the Communion,' persuaded him to receive the Sacrament. 'Immediately after communion' B. left A.'s pew, and was found 'late at night, mad with drink, in a gin-shop near the church.' We cannot, of course, doubt the fact, and, although it is difficult to imagine that any clergyman would engage a 'Scripture reader' who from whatever cause was a non-communicant, we must accept the statement that this occurrence took place in the Church of England. But there are certain phenomena in this and similar stories to which we beg attention. The church must have been one in which Zwinglian teaching prevailed;

the
men
susp
and
para
ing,
ever
who
train
who
day:
Euc
with
dips
to r
men
with
he i
v

phy
eith
phy
alco
the
our
pres
lent
alco
dang
temp
view
grac
falle

read
if th
in gr
of th
been
prop
abou
shall

1
zine,
VO

the person in question had probably no real faith in Sacramental grace; and, although it is not distinctly stated, we suspect that the celebration was held, after the excitement and fatigue of a day's work, in the evening. The story is paralleled by another recently told at a 'Blue Ribbon' meeting, at which a case somewhat similar occurred after an evening celebration.¹ We appeal with confidence to clergymen who teach the reality of Sacramental grace, whose people are trained in an intelligent appreciation of Sacramental blessings, whose celebrations, whether in the early morning or at mid-day, are conducted with the dignity and reverence which the Eucharist demands, to say whether such cases have ever come within their experience? If, here and there, a lately recovered dipsomaniac, with mind and will as yet unhealed, is unable to receive the chalice with safety under existing bodily and mental conditions, then he is surely for the time being better without a Sacrament which, as a judgment upon former sin, he is as yet incapable of using aright.

We are quite aware that intemperance is sometimes a physical as well as a moral evil, but we decline to believe either that intoxication is in the great majority of cases a physical disease, or that, even where the law of heredity in alcohol operates, the grace of God is powerless to release the body as well as the soul of a man who yields his will to our Lord, and is constantly strengthened by His indwelling presence. We feel bound to say that much of the prevalent teaching in regard to the subject of 'the heredity of alcohol' (*Wines &c.*, pp. 130-132) appears to us most dangerous, for it is not to alcohol only that men will be tempted to apply it. But it has often been noted that low views of Sacraments, involving denial of the reality of divine grace, are accompanied by despair of the recovery of our fallen nature.

To the appeal of Dr. Kerr we feel confident that our readers can only give a decided and emphatic negative: but if the discussion of this very painful question should result in greater care being taken as to the unadulterated character of the wine used at the Holy Communion, it will not have been altogether in vain. It is much to be regretted that a proposal made in 1662 to add to the paragraph of the Rubric about the Eucharistic elements the words 'the wine also shall be of the best and purest that may be had,' was not

¹ See letter by the Rev. W. Reid, D.D., *United Presbyterian Magazine*, May 1875.

actually carried out.¹ There is no doubt that many of the wines now in use are open to grave objections, and we think that it would be a wise and prudent step if a Committee were appointed by Convocation to investigate the question and, after submitting certain specimens to thoroughly qualified public analysts, to report the result for the guidance of the clergy.

And with the Bishop of Bedford² we would plead also for a general restoration of the mixed chalice, not only on this special ground of mercy, but upon higher ones also. The ceremonial admixture during the service has, we are aware, been forbidden by the judgment of the last Dean of the Arches,³ but a mixture previous to the commencement of the Office has been sanctioned by that Court, and it is in harmony with the usage of all the Oriental Churches. Probably this would not meet the views of persons to whom 'it is a matter of perfect indifference what any ecclesiastical authority may decree,'⁴ but it would, we trust, simplify difficulties possibly felt by some who in their advocacy of total abstinence as a discipline, or as an act of self-denial on behalf of others, do not allow themselves to forget the reverence due to the Sacrament of Our Lord's own institution, the claims of Church order, and the real risk of confusion and strife at the holiest service,⁵ if alcoholic wine and unfermented fluids are indiscriminately used.

In matters ecclesiastical as in matters political it is a fatal mistake, however excellent an object may be and however disinterested the motives of its promoters, to allow it to be supposed that matters of essential principle can be treated as open questions. We consider that this rule of action, which is of the first importance, should be firmly upheld by all instructed Churchmen who join, as we hope they will continue to do in increasing numbers, in direct temperance work. We do not, of course, suppose that the opinions of Dr. Kerr are likely to be adopted by the Executive Committee of the Church of England Temperance Society in their official capacity, but anyone who has acquainted himself with the weekly newspaper which is the official organ of the society, will be aware of the prominent

¹ Scudamore, *N. E.* p. 381.

² Sermon at S. Paul's, *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, May 7, 1880.

³ *Martin v. Mackonochie*. In the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*, we do not forget that the Court of Appeal declared any mixture illegal.

⁴ *Wines &c.*, p. 150.

⁵ Bishop Wordsworth, *Diocesan Addresses*, 1876, p. 47.

place which has not unfrequently been afforded for the exposition of the views advanced in *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical*, and will have noted the deference with which they are received.¹ The writer of these pages has now for some years been himself a worker as a total abstainer in the society, and there is no wish whatever to hold the Executive responsible for any utterances beyond those of its officers and speakers specially appointed to deputational work: but we cannot imagine occasions more important than some of those on which the opinions we so sincerely deplore have been either hinted at or openly expressed.² Evidence of the clearest kind lies before us, showing that the reception of these opinions in a form still cruder has too often been the sequel of the Blue Ribbon Gospel Temperance Missions,³ and to these Missions the Executive of the Church of England Temperance Society have given an emphatic approval by inviting Mr. R. T. Booth, who claims to be the founder of the movement, to speak in the presence of 27,000 persons at the Annual Temperance Fête at the Crystal Palace on July 4, 1882.⁴ As

¹ See *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, vol. vii. pp. 597, 793; ix. 722, 315; x. 649.

² At the Anniversary Meeting of the Total Abstinence Section in 1881, and at the Church Congress, October 1882. The lecture in the Chapter House of S. Paul's was very fully reported, and 'Wines: Scriptural and Ecclesiastical' is on sale at the dépôt of the C.E.T.S.

³ That this movement is thoroughly dissenting in its character is amply proved by the *Blue Ribbon Official Gazette*, although that paper is edited by 'the Rev. M. Baxter, Clergyman of the Church of England.' It has many of the most objectionable features of the Salvation Army, although it has not as yet proceeded to so much irreverence in its services. It is sometimes denied that it has any organization, yet the 'Army' now possesses sixty halls throughout England in which 'the glad tidings of the Gospel, together with the duty of temperance, are proclaimed nearly every evening, and these buildings are included, like those possessed by any other dissenting sect, in the returns issued by the Registrar-General.' See *Whitaker's Almanack*, 1883, p. 209. We believe that the object of the movement is not only to inculcate temperance, but to introduce the idea of a colourless Christianity from which all distinctive teaching of Church principles shall be eliminated. Canon Basil Wilberforce is reported to have said, 'The blue ribbon was the great source of unity in the Church; it smashed up sectarianism' (Speech at Aldershot, Oct. 11, 1882). The character of the Blue Ribbon and kindred movements is explained in an excellent paper by the Rev. T. P. Ring, Vicar of Hanley, published at the Church of England Temperance Dépôt, Lichfield, and to this we would refer our readers.

⁴ See also a speech by Canon Ellison, *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, vol. x. p. 524. The pamphlet referred to has been published in a separate form under the title of '*The Blue Ribbon Army, or Gospel Temperance Mission—its Relation to, and Bearing upon, the Church of England Temperance Society.*' C.E.T.S. Publication Dépôt, price 1d.

we write, we note with the deepest regret that Canon Ellison has just issued a pamphlet in which distinct and formal encouragement is given, on behalf of the Executive Committee, to active co-operation in these so-called Missions. Into all the bearings of this step we may not now enter; but the leaders of the society cannot be made to understand too plainly that the price of the patronage of the 'Blue Ribbon Movement,' and the teaching which is its issue, will be the alienation of many earnest Churchmen who would otherwise be found among its most hearty and enthusiastic supporters. These will be obliged to work in other ways for the promotion of temperance and the rescue of the drunkard. Opinions such as have been reviewed in this article too often originate in a failure to grasp in their fulness the root-principles of the kingdom of the Incarnation, and in regard to the particular matter which has been before us, if the Executive Committee of the Society desires to retain the confidence of a large section of the English Church, its members must have the courage to say boldly that for us the question of the use of unfermented wine at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist is closed, because 'we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God.'

THE RETROSPECT OF 1882.

THE CHURCH AT HOME: THE END OF 1882.

WE reviewed the year in our last number at the close of the active season. But in the three months which have since elapsed events of so much interest to Churchmen have succeeded each other that we cannot afford to wait till the autumn of 1883 to refer to them. Admirable in every personal quality as Archbishop Tait was, he did not merely shine by personal merits. Riskful and mistaken his public policy no doubt was in various details, particularly in the earlier years of his episcopate: but he was one who learned by experience, and he had the distinguished excellence in a public man of grasping and putting forth the dignity and power of his office, and by the unexpected and unwonted strength which he infused into the Primacy of All England he has put the mark of inexperience against that favourite creation of modern statesmanship, a weak Archbishop of Canterbury. Bright as are the hopes raised by the prospect of the Archiepiscopate of one who under the influence of a nature both energetic and sympathetic unites apprehension of the past and mastery of the present as the Bishop of Truro has shown himself to do, yet his succession has been rendered more easy by the career of the last Metropolitan having led

public
On hi
and p
while,
Mr. S
Lond
recog
consu
night
of Ma
Mr.
deple
believ
the F
C
bisho
Llan
and p
articl
conti
antiq
men
tingu
and

No
Colo
Bark
episc
care
regio
over
Stee
hur
less
self
colo
in h
from
with
the
Lich
reco
bee
is i
Lea
alre

Bre

public opinion to expect self-assertion in the holder of the office. On his death-bed Archbishop Tait, by a single stroke alike generous and politic, went far to reverse the main error of his administration; while, in the exchange carried out between Mr. Mackonochie and Mr. Suckling—for which also great thanks are due to the Bishop of London—we see the earnest of peace in the Church by a liberal recognition of the claims of the Ceremonial party. To this happy consummation the *Times* stood sponsor, and then in less than a fortnight was found applauding the inconceivable perversity of the Bishop of Manchester in refusing, on grounds of irritating pettiness, to induct Mr. Cowgill to Mr. Green's late living of Miles Platting. It is deplorable to view this wanton prolongation of strife; but if, as we believe, the bishop's proceeding has no warrant of law, it will not be the High Church party who will be the final sufferers.

Other deaths of distinguished Churchmen besides that of the Archbishop have marked the closing months of 1882. In Bishop Ollivant of Llandaff we have an instance of decided opinion allied to sympathy and judicial fairness. We may reveal that he was the author of the article on the Welsh Church in our last number. Archdeacon Randall continued the best tradition of the learned High Churchman of an antique type. Dean Close was a foremost leader among Low Churchmen; while Professor Challis and Sir Thomas Watson, both distinguished Cambridge graduates, showed that in England science and faith could go hand in hand.

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION OUT OF ENGLAND.

No fewer than nine vacancies have occurred in the ranks of the Colonial and Missionary Episcopate during the past year. Bishop Barker, of Sydney, died in Europe at an advanced age, and after an episcopate of twenty-eight years. Bishop Merriman, whose long career had been full of the dangers which surround travellers in wild regions and among wild races, met his death by the commonplace overturning of a little pony-carriage close to his own door. Bishop Steere died almost suddenly at Zanzibar shortly after paying a too hurried visit to this country; and Bishop Fauquier, of Algoma, a less well-known prelate, died at his post in the midst of abundant and self-denying labours in one of the poorest and most neglected of our colonial dioceses. Bishop Short has resigned the See of Adelaide in his eightieth year. Bishops Mitchinson and Bromby have returned from Barbados and Tasmania respectively and have taken benefices with the view of adding to their parochial work the duty of assisting, the former the Bishop of Peterborough, the latter the Bishop of Lichfield, in the care of their dioceses. Bishop Titcomb, not having recovered from the effects of a fall in the Tounghoo Mountains, has been compelled to resign work to which he was no longer equal, and is invalided at home. Bishop Cheetham, having resigned Sierra Leone, accepted, first, a benefice in Yorkshire, from which he has already moved to West Cowes.

To the dioceses of Barbados and Rangoon the Rev. Herbert Bree and the Rev. J. M. Strachan were respectively appointed, and

they were consecrated together on the Festival of SS. Philip and James. The Bishop of Rangoon holds a diploma as a medical man. He is not the only Bishop who has this distinction, for it is shared by the Bishop of S. John's, Kaffraria, the Rev. Dr. Callaway. The Rev. G. W. Kennion, Vicar of All Saints, Bradford, was consecrated on S. Andrew's Day Bishop of Adelaide. The other sees are still void, and we cannot forbear to call attention to the free and ready way in which Colonial Synods appraise the merits and qualifications of distinguished men in England, with an evident belief that they have only to 'throw the handkerchief' to them and they will be prompt to become their Bishops. This has been notably the case recently at Sydney; we suppose that it is only to be prevented by suggesting to colonial synodsmen that such conduct is not in good taste, and may make the synodsmen themselves ridiculous. Another see remains vacant, and there is good ground for hoping that it will never again be filled; we refer to the Anglo-German bishopric at Jerusalem, which has now existed for forty-one years without fulfilling the expectations either of its promoters or of its opponents.

The Bishop of Cape Town has been in England for a few months, and has returned to Africa in time to preside over the Provincial Synod which will be held in this current month of January. We have in a former number dealt with the Grahamstown judgment. We trust that the Synod of South Africa will take no hasty action. True wisdom lies in a Fabian policy, and until the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts has been presented to the Crown, any action in regard to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council would be premature. Those who think that its position will be maintained unchanged, and that its contradictory utterances will still be permitted to add to the perplexities of lawyers all over the world, must have a sanguine belief in the doctrine that threatened institutions live long.

In another part of the world a vast empire is rapidly growing up, and in the North-West of Canada a virgin soil and cheap land are attracting hosts of immigrants from the older Canadian provinces, as well as from England and the Continent of Europe. Attention is being called to this development, wholly without precedent in the growth even of our Colonial Empire, in the newspapers and by other means, but the figures are so large that we hardly realize the vast scale on which these future colonies are being founded. When the Bishop of Rupert's Land states that the population of the city of Winnipeg was in 1865 250, and that at the close of 1880 it was 12,000, and twelve months later was 20,000, we can understand how natural is his lordship's anxiety that provision should at once be made for the vast multitudes who are settling down in his diocese. For these crowds are really settling down; no sudden discovery of gold has produced 'a rush'; it is only the temptation of cheap land and fruitful soil, and the prospect of easy communication with the rest of the world at no distant time, on the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has attracted and is attracting an industrious immigration that will rapidly occupy the territory extending from Lake Winnipeg to

the Rocky Mountains. It is obvious that the resources of a young and struggling diocese are quite unequal to the sudden strain to which Rupert's Land is now subjected; if the mother Church does not assist, and that lavishly, for the next few years, the colony will not be Pagan, for the Dissenting communities of England and Canada are fully conscious of the position and are liberally helping their members; but the Church, which has had a good start, will lag miserably in the background, and will never recover the position which it is possible for her now to maintain.

The Bishop of Guiana, the Nestor of the Colonial Church, completed the fortieth year of his episcopate on S. Bartholomew's Day. The occasion was duly commemorated in the colony; many addresses were presented to the venerable Bishop, who, in good health and with unabated vigour, is prosecuting his work in a diocese which of late years has become one of the most remarkable spheres of evangelistic work, in consequence of the conditions of the colony, which demand the immigration of many thousands of coolies from China and India. These showed their gratitude to the Church in the person of the Bishop. The Chinese address, signed by 169 communicants, was written on a large sheet of silk; and the Indian coolies presented an address in Hindi and Urdu, which was signed by 239 persons in Urdu, Hindi, Tamil and Bengali. Such a day was a memorable one indeed, and the Governor of the colony, in presenting the address of the English clergy and laity, was fully justified in remarking that, 'while a large proportion of Bishops appointed to colonial sees subsequently to his lordship have been obliged to retire from their work, the senior Bishop in the whole of her Majesty's dominions is one who has had the courage to spend and be spent, protected withal by Almighty God, amidst the many dangers of a climate so often fatal to the European constitution.'

THE OLD CATHOLICS.

THE number of the members of the Old Catholic Church remains much the same. In the towns they have had some gains, in the country some losses, but no material change has taken place in the sum total of 100,000 souls.

In Germany the Ultramontanes have been strong enough to inflict a petty insult on them in the Prussian House of Deputies by denying them the name of Catholics in the ecclesiastical budget vote, and to do them a serious injury at Munich by withdrawing from them the use of the church of S. Nicolas, which they have held for the last eleven years. The plea on which this was done was that Bishop Reinkens had administered confirmation in the church, which the now Ultramontane majority of the Town Council of Munich pronounced to be a sacrilegious act. Thereupon they resumed the church, and handed it over to the Roman Catholics. The Old Catholics have appealed to their brethren in Germany and to their sympathizers elsewhere for help, by means of which they hope to build themselves a new church.

In Austria, where Old Catholicism has had so uphill a work to

do, one of the few priests belonging to the Old Catholic body, Pfarrer Kürzinger of Ried, has been induced, partly by the Bishop of Linz, an Ultramontane of the Ultramontanes, and partly perhaps by the pressure of poverty, to pass across to the Roman Catholic ranks. He has been followed by only two women of his congregation, and a new priest is about to be appointed in his room. There are ten Old Catholic communities in Austria, but only three of them have been rich enough to provide themselves with an Austrian-born priest, and the Government, which is anxious to stamp out Old Catholicism, takes good care that none but an Austrian-born priest shall be appointed or shall officiate even for a day. The Austrian Old Catholic Synod is making efforts to supply Meistersdorf and Aeussing with pfarrers as well as Ried.

The Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland (Bishop Herzog explains that the title *Christian Catholic* was 'the name gladly adopted in Switzerland from the earliest ages by those who did not wish to call themselves *Roman Catholics*') has lost the doubtful advantage that it derived from being put in possession of parishes in the canton of Berne, where it had not a real majority of the population on its side. It obtained this position through Pius IX. having forbidden the Roman Catholics to vote for the parish priest, according to the ancient national custom, on pain of excommunication. The result was that in some thirty places the Old Catholics, although in a minority, elected the curé. Leo XIII., reversing the policy of Pius, desired the Roman Catholics to take part in the ensuing election, and they have in consequence ousted their Old Catholic competitors by their preponderance of votes. There are some towns, such as Porrentruy, where, if the Old Catholic pfarrer had shown more zeal, the congregation might have been kept together, but this was not the case in many of these places. Bishop Herzog has during the year issued a Pastoral in which he once more states and defends the Old Catholic position. Their strength, he says, lies in 'the Catholic and national character' of their Church, in their firm maintenance of the Creeds, in an open Bible, in personal piety; and he justifies the introduction of such reforms as the use of the vulgar tongue, the marriage of the clergy, voluntary in place of enforced confession, the restoration of the cup, the election of bishops and priests.

In Italy an effort has been made by Count Campello to arouse his countrymen to an interest in religious reform on the basis of the Nicene Creed, the six Œcumenical Councils, the election of bishops and priests, the recognition of the Pope of Rome as no more than *primus inter pares*, liturgical worship in the vulgar tongue, marriage of the clergy, and voluntary confession. His effort has not met with present success, as the average Italian layman takes no interest at all in religion, and the priests are under the absolute government and control of their bishops, who are themselves nominated by the Pope. Count Campello is himself a regular attendant and communicant at the American Church, and has found some spiritual and pastoral work to do among the Jews in Rome. He has expressed a strong desire to make himself acquainted with the working of the Church in

England. Padre Curci, who has taken up a position similar to that long occupied by Passaglia, since the publication of his *Nuovo Testamento* has been preparing a Commentary on the Psalms, which he is about to issue. The relations between him and the Vatican are so strained that he is not allowed to preach nor even to say Mass except privately in his own house. A little more, and the chain would snap.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Pulpit Commentary. Exodus : Exposition and Homiletics, by the Rev. GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. *Deuteronomy*, by the Rev. W. L. ALEXANDER, D.D., and Dr. CLEMANCE. (London : Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1882.)

A COMMENTARY on the Book of Exodus can hardly fail to be interesting, from the number and the striking character of the incidents to be treated of ; and that before us is no exception to the rule. In Canon Rawlinson we have a writer who is well acquainted with the literature of the subject, and qualified to put the reader of our day *au fait* with the mass of facts bearing on the subjects of the Israelite sojourn in Egypt and their remarkable Exodus therefrom, which recent travel and exploration, and more direct researches into the remaining monuments of those distant ages, afford.

The great advance of Egyptology during the present generation, the useful work of the Palestine Exploration Fund, the writings of Brugsch Bey, Robinson, Palmer, and others, have each their store of facts to adduce, and these have been carefully noted and used. Canon Rawlinson very wisely declines to accept Dr. Brugsch's brilliant theory so recently put forward, that what the Israelites crossed was not the Red Sea at all, but a lagoon leading from the Mediterranean, and that the Egyptian army perished in the waters of Lake Serbonis. But his counter arguments do not seem very cogent, though perhaps we have no reason to complain if, after this lapse of time, no really substantial refutation is forthcoming of an arbitrary theory. On the other hand, the section on the Mosaic authorship of the book is admirably and ably argued, and must carry conviction to every candid mind. The clear, succinct summary of 'Early Egyptian History and Chronology' will be of great use to many readers to whom most treatises on the subject are unintelligible because of technicalities, though some of its conclusions are disputable (see pp. xxiii-xxv). It is curious to notice that the 'lice' of the third plague (*kinnim*) are identified with the 'mosquitoes' (Egyptian *khennems*), and the fourth is made to be not 'flies,' which on this supposition would be *included* in the third, but 'beetles'—both probable suppositions.

On the whole, this seems to us a very good volume indeed. The

Homiletic element is about the same as in previous volumes, and requires no special remark. Surely, however, it is puerile to talk of Egypt as being 'God's Aldershot' (p. 8): nor is it accurate either, for the Israelites were simply slaves in Egypt, not soldiers.

Another volume of the same work treats of Deuteronomy. The 'Introduction' appears to us a careful, industrious, and painstaking *résumé* of the evidence for the authenticity of the book. The writer unhesitatingly accepts and defends the integrity of the book, now so fiercely assailed in many quarters, while candidly admitting possible exceptions. He allows that it may yet be fairly inquired 'whether there may not be portions of it which are additions to the original writing, or interpolations introduced by some later writer.' For example, he is disposed to regard the ethnographical notices as being such. 'They have, it must be confessed,' he says, 'very much the appearance of being interpolations, and may possibly be glosses that have been introduced by some editor of the work into the text.' The account of the appointment of the cities of refuge on the east of Jordan (iv. 41-43) and Moses' song (xxxiii. 1-43) he assigns to the original hand. Of the latter insertion into the body of the narrative he observes:—

'It is urged that this song is so constructed that the Divine guidance of Israel (v. 12, &c.) and their ingratitude (v. 15, &c.) are referred to as things already past. But this ignores the *prophetic* character of the song, and mistakes the style of the prophetic utterance. Moses was a prophet; and the prophets, or seers, not only looked to the future, but beheld it as present; and the energy of their perception of it stamped itself on their words, so that they very frequently represent as actually before them or as already done what in reality was yet future. So familiar is this usage that grammarians have recognized the "prophetic perfect" as an idiom of the Hebrew. Nor is it in prophecy alone that this presentation of the future as actual is to be found; the poet also claims liberty to do the same, and exercises it freely. Even if Moses, then, be regarded as only an uninspired poet, the use of the preterite in the passages referred to may be accounted for without supposing that the song is the production of a later writer.' (P. xxxvii.)

It appears to us that this reassertion of the venerable age and the substantial integrity of the book is a timely one. The tactics of late adopted to discredit it are to avoid argument and to assert its non-Mosaic character as a patent fact, long since demonstrated and not deserving a reiteration of the proof. It is the same method over again which Bishop Butler, in the 'Advertisement' to his great treatise, noticed as having been observed by himself. 'It has come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much as a subject of enquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious; and accordingly they treat it as if in the present age this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule.'

Just so the freethinkers of the day behave now; and therefore we welcome the present volume, with its sensible and modest Introduction. We do not find much that is novel in it, though the homiletic part of it is fairly good.

The Medical Language of S. Luke. By the Rev. WILLIAM KIRK HOBART, LL.D., ex-Scholar, Trinity College, Dublin. (Dublin : Hodges ; London : Longmans, 1882.)

THE object of this work is to establish the fact that the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles are both 'the works of a person well acquainted with the language of the Greek medical schools,' a fact which, if established, will of course serve as a strong confirmation of the belief of the Church that both works are written by the same person, and that that person is 'Luke the beloved physician.' The method by which Dr. Hobart seeks to establish his case is a thorough and exhaustive comparison of the vocabulary of the writer of these books with the phraseology of the Greek medical writers whose works have come down to us, viz., Hippocrates (B.C. 460-357); Aretæus (first century A.D.); Galen (A.D. 130-200); and Dioscorides (first or second century A.D.). The work as a whole is excellently done. Dr. Hobart is wisely not content with mere references, but quotes the illustrative passages in full, so that everyone can draw his own conclusions from them. It will be obvious how greatly this increases the value of the volume. It enables us to weigh the evidence for ourselves, and if we are forced sometimes to dispute the conclusions at which the author arrives, it is he himself who supplies us with the material on which to form our judgment, and furnishes us with arguments which may perhaps be turned against him.

The book is divided into two parts, the first of which is devoted to a careful examination of the language used in the accounts of the miracles of healing in the third Gospel and the Acts. Here we have, as is natural, all the more familiar instances of medical language, pointed out by commentators from time immemorial, such as *πυρετός μέγας, ἀχλύς, βάσεις καὶ σφυρά, παραλελυμένος* (instead of *παραλυτικός* as in S. Matthew and S. Mark). These are stock examples with which every one is familiar; but besides these Dr. Hobart points out how much more carefully S. Luke describes the details of the miracles of healing than do the other Evangelists, and how the precise words which he uses may in almost every case be illustrated by analogous usages in the professedly medical writers named above.

The second part is intended to establish the fact that

'S. Luke did not forget or abandon the language of his earlier years and professional training on becoming a Christian teacher and historian; but that even in his general narrative he frequently employs words and phrases, when they suited his purpose, to which, from long association, he had become habituated through his early studies and professional pursuits.' (P. 86.)

This part contains some of the most striking and convincing examples, and also, we fear we must add, some of the very weakest. It is really a little too much to ask us to believe that the reason why S. Luke alone records the saying 'If he shall ask an egg will he offer him a scorpion' is that it

'would be likely to impress itself on a physician's mind—from the

medical opposition, as it were, between the things' (why medical opposition?), 'and from his familiarity with the words. The egg was a frequent prescription for the nourishment of invalids and an ingredient in medical compounds; and the venom of the scorpion's sting had frequently to be medically treated.' (P. 135.)

All this is highly ingenious, but it is scarcely argument. Nor is it much more to the point to be told that *σκάφη* (which S. Luke uses in Acts xxvii. 32 for a *boat*) was the medical name of the *moveable bath*, *σκαφίς* that of a *measure for medicine*! and *σκαφοειδές* that of a *bone*! (p. 279). The information may be perfectly correct, but what in the world has it got to do with the fact that S. Luke uses *σκάφη* for a boat? Indeed a clever controversialist might just as plausibly argue that the passage in question could not have been written by a medical man, because to him *σκάφη* would have meant the moveable bath, and not the boat. Thus Dr. Hobart is playing with edged tools; and as he has so many really strong and conclusive instances of medical language, it is a pity that he should burden his pages with such specimens as these, and weaken his case by the endeavour to prove too much. As examples of the more valuable portion of his work we may select the following, which are of a very different character from the ones alluded to above:—

'In recording Our Lord's saying: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God," S. Matthew (xix. 24) uses the words—

διὰ τρυπήματος ραφίδος.

S. Mark (x. 25) has much the same, viz.—

διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιᾶς τῆς ραφίδος.

S. Luke (xviii. 25), however, employs a different expression—

διὰ τρήματος βελόνης.

The words used by S. Luke are those which a medical man would naturally employ, for *βελόνη* was the *surgical needle*, and *τρήμα* the *great medical word for a perforation of any kind*. But still further, we meet with the same expression in Galen, *Comm.* ii. 7, *Offic.* (xviii. B. 740): ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὅτι ῥάμμα τοῦ διατρήματος τῆς βελόνης διηρμένον ἕνεκα τοῦ συνάγειν ἀλλήλοις ἦτοι τὰ μέρη τοῦ διατετρημένου σώματος. And to express the puncture made by the needle: διὰ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν βελόνην τρήματος, Galen, *Sang. in Arter.* 2 (ii. 708).² (P. 60.)

Again, on Acts x. 11, 'And saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners (τέσσαρσιν ἄρχαῖς), and let down to the earth,' we read as follows:—

'ἀρχαί, in the sense it bears here, is peculiar to S. Luke, as also is *δθόνη*; and the phrase *ἀρχαὶ δθόνης* bears clearly on the face of it the mark of a medical hand, for this strange use of *ἀρχαί*, "the beginnings," for "the ends," was the technical expression in medical language for the ends of bandages, instead of *πέρατα* employed in ordinary language. Galen remarks on this use, *Comm. Offic.* ii. 8 (xviii. B. 748): καὶ τισιν ἔδοξεν ἀρχὰς ἐπιδέσμων ἀκούειν ἀντὶ τοῦ πέρατα, καίτοι γενικώτερον ὄνομα τὸ πέρασ ἐστὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς.² (P. 218.)

These instances, it will be seen at once, are worth something; and though they are perhaps the strongest, yet they by no means stand alone. Taken as a whole the work is undoubtedly an instructive one, and contains an immense amount of curious and useful information on a subject which has hitherto been very little noticed. The instances require careful sifting, and a large number may require to be struck out as being nothing to the point. But after all necessary deductions have been made, a sufficient number of really solid ones will remain to justify Dr. Hobart's conclusion that

'there would seem to be a vein of medical language running through the general history, and appearing chiefly in the use of some words peculiar to the author, or in the use of others which, though not peculiar to him, are yet of more frequent occurrence in his writings than in the rest of the New Testament, and all of which were in common use with the Greek physicians.' (P. 54.)

The Book of Enoch: translated from the Ethiopic, with Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph.D., Professor in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio. 1882.

THE Book of Enoch, though held in some estimation by several early Christian authors, and quoted also by Jewish writers, disappeared for many centuries, and was only known through the references in the Fathers and some extracts made by Syncellus in the eighth century in his *Chronography*. In 1773 the famous traveller Bruce discovered three copies of the Ethiopic version of the Book, and brought them with him to Europe. The Book, however, attracted but little attention until Archbishop Laurence published his translation in 1821, which went through two more editions in 1833 and 1838. Since that time the book has been subjected to a more thorough examination and analysis by German scholars and critics, and a useful digest of their results is now given by Dr. Schodde, together with a careful English translation and copious notes on the text.

The opinion of the majority of critics (p. 26) is that Enoch, like the Fourth of Esdras and other Apocryphal books, is a compilation, gathered from works by different authors; or that the book in its present form contains the original treatise, together with a framework of interpolations by other hands.

I. The original treatise, which was the groundwork of the present one, is supposed to include chapters i. to xxxvi., and chapters lxxii. to cv.

II. The interpolation in chapters xxxvii. to lxi. is described as *the Parables*. These are found to differ from the original treatise in their doctrine of angels, demons, and the world to come.

III. There are the *Noachic fragments*, which as claiming to be revelations to Noah, are foreign to the original plan, which was the description of the visions of Noah's progenitor Enoch. These fragments occur in chapters liv. 7 to lv. 2; lxx. 1 to lxx. 25; in chapters lx., cvi., and cvii.

To each of these portions an attempt has been made to assign a date by means of internal evidence.

The *original treatise*, since it contains the prophecy of the judgment quoted in S. Jude's Epistle, is generally assigned to a period prior to the Christian era. The complaints of the oppression of the saints by the ungodly, the hope of a just retribution in a future world, and of a speedy vengeance on the wicked, point to a time of persecution from heathen rulers, such as the faithful and pious Jews encountered at the beginning of the Maccabean struggle. The aim of the author was to restore the faith of his people in the promises of God, when it was sorely tried by calamities and reverses. Enoch was a name naturally connected with the hope of immortality which nerved the faithful to resist unto death the tyrannical attempts of Antiochus Epiphanes to force them to apostasy. Thus Enoch (chapters cii., ciii.) beholds Sheol as the place of departed spirits both good and bad. In chapter xxii. it is divided into four compartments: one for those righteous who died at the hands of sinners, the second for the other saints, the third for the sinners who were not punished on earth, the fourth for those whose retribution was partially given them before death. The wicked shall rise again for punishment, the righteous to partake of the glories of the Messiah's kingdom. But the Messiah of the *original treatise* differs from the Messiah of the *Parables*, being only a Deliverer and Conqueror, represented in the allegory in chapter xc. as a bullock with large horns, whilst the other princes of Israel are sheep (p. 40). The treatise also contains the fable of the angelic parentage of the giants in Gen. vi., which is related with much coarseness of detail. This notion about the fallen angels and the Nephilim, as well as the story of their communicating the knowledge of arts and inventions to mankind, may have been partly derived from Enoch by the early Christian writers who quote them. The doctrine is repudiated by the 'Book of Adam and Eve' (*Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xv. p. 225), and by the best Christian authors of the fourth and fifth centuries. A large portion of the treatise is devoted to an account of nature and its laws. Chapter lxxii. to lxxxii. is called 'the book of the courses of the luminaries of heaven, how it is with each one of them as to their classes, their governments, and their times.' There are twelve gates of the sun, out of six he ascends, and into six he descends. These gates vary through the 364 days of the year, which answer to the years of Enoch's earthly career. Then similar laws are given for the circuit of the moon. Uriel, the holy angel, is Enoch's instructor upon these points. Then follow the gates of the winds, whence proceed drought, rain, and dew; then the moon's waxing and waning is explained. Evil days are predicted, in which the years shall be shortened and the moon shall change her order. A lengthy allegory follows, in which the characters in the sacred history are represented as cows, elephants, camels, asses, sheep, &c. This allegory extends from Adam and Eve to the times of the author.

The *Parables*, three in number, occupy chapters xxxvii. to lxxi. The author of these is thought to differ from the writer of the *original treatise* in his doctrine as to the Messiah and the future state. Here God is called the Ancient of Days, as in Daniel, but more frequently

the 'Lord of Spirits.' Angels are more distinctly divided into ranks—Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim. Instead of the Nephilim, or demons, who are the offspring of the angels, there are Satans, or angels of vengeance, who punish the mighty ones after their condemnation in the final judgment. The offences of princes and rulers being especially dwelt upon, it has been inferred that the author lived in a degenerate period of the Jewish kingdom; and from the mention of the Parthians, a date as late as the time of Herod the Great has been arrived at. The *Parables*, as distinct from the original treatise, set forth the supernatural character of the Messiah, and speak of his pre-existence, as one whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting. Much of this is based on the vision of the Son of Man in Daniel vii.; and from the same source the doctrine is derived that all earthly kingdoms were to fade away and vanish in the presence of the kingdom of the Messiah; and the ascribing to Him especially of the office of Judge.

The *Noachic fragments* give no evidence of date, but it is supposed that the author wrote after the production of the *Parables*, and borrowed from them. Here the Deluge, omitted in the other parts, is especially dwelt upon, as fulfilling the predictions of Enoch.

We gladly welcome Dr. Schodde's volume, both for its exhaustive treatment of the subject, and as a fresh evidence of the interest which has of late years been awakened in Jewish Apocryphal literature.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum, editum consilio et impensis academice litterarum Cæsareæ Vindobonensis. Vol. VI. Magni Felicis Ennodii opera omnia ex recensione GUILIELMI HARTELII. Vindobonæ, 1882.

ENNODIUS is not a very attractive writer. Nine books of letters are full of emptiness and affectation, while the panegyric he addresses to Theodoric is as nauseous as the most shameless flattery can make it. Sicily does duty for 'Ethiopia and the tropic,' and Pannonia for 'the cold of Scythia.' Every sentence is a conundrum of perverse bombast, combining Tacitean difficulty with Ennodian inanity. Hard nuts these for the reader, and always empty. Even his epigrams are witless enough, and this when they are also something worse than witless. Nor is the poverty of his writings redeemed by any dignity of personal character, for in this respect Ennodius is no match for his nearest literary compeers. Symmachus breaks into genuine eloquence in his pleadings for the ancient faith of Rome, and Sidonius kindles into patriotism during the Arvernian war of independence; but Ennodius never rises above himself. He is a trifler from first to last.

Yet the historian has an interest even in this poor caricature of Mamertinus and Pacatus. His want of salient character is not surprising in an age of exhaustion, for however the literary coteries of Gaul and Italy might ignore the calamities of the Western Empire, they could not long survive its fall. We see Ennodius at his best on another side, as a fairly decent Christian bishop and a sincere admirer of his nobler predecessor Epiphanius. His chief value to us is in the facts we glean from him. In the absence of other material,

he is our best authority on the quarrel between Anthemius and Ricimer, on some aspects of the cession of Auvergne by Nepos to the Visigoths, and on the details of Theodoric's conquest of Italy.

As regards the text of Ennodius, little had been done for it since the editions of Schott and Sirmond in 1611 before the appearance of the present volume. It was entrusted by the Vienna Academy to the able hands of the editor of Cyprian, and has been executed by him with the same care as the earlier volumes of the series. It is enriched with new critical materials, and furnished with the same fourfold index as the others.

Erasmus Redivivus, sive de Curia Romana hucusque insanabili.
Scripsit CONSTANTINUS SCHLOTTMANN. Tom. I. (Halis: 1883.)

THIS volume is the first instalment of a work which has a double aim. The author, a Professor at Halle, whose studies have led him to pay especial attention to the revival of learning which ushered in the Reformation, seeks by an independent investigation to arrive at a critical estimate of the character and work of Erasmus. The ulterior purpose of the book is to compare Erasmus with Döllinger and the modern opponents of Vaticanism, and to discuss the recent policy of the Roman Curia. The last-named subject is reserved for the second volume, which is promised in the course of another year.

Of the introductory chapters the second, which deals with the history of the unhappy Vatican Council of 1870 and its sequel, has already excited considerable attention in Germany, where it originally appeared in the form of a 'programme.' For those who are interested in the Old Catholic movement, and in the other questions partly religious partly political which have of late so deeply stirred the national life of Germany, this portion of the work will possess much interest, as reflecting the judgment of a cultivated and responsible critic, who has lived in the heart of the struggle, and is capable of appreciating its significance.

For ourselves, the most attractive part of the present volume is that which brings us into sight of Erasmus and his times. The author does not profess to rewrite the biography of his hero, a task which he tells us is about to be executed by other hands. The earlier scenes of the great scholar's life, including those which connect him with England and the English Universities, pass almost unnoticed in the pages before us. But his character and conduct are submitted to an examination in which, *more Germanorum*, the minutest details are made subservient to a scientific appreciation of the whole; and this will amply repay the careful reader. Especially we would direct attention to the chapters in which Erasmus is brought face to face with Luther. The comparison is drawn with great fairness and with a firm hand and full knowledge of the facts. We think, however, that the author is disposed to overstate the extent of his hero's agreement with the Reformer of Wittenberg. The truth is that Erasmus had little inclination for the thorny paths of polemical theology. His instincts were those of a man of letters rather than of a religious controversialist. Of the sincerity of his religion there can be no doubt;

but religion in his eyes was synonymous with a simple and practical faith in the Person of Our Lord. For the rest he was content to submit himself to the judgment of the Church. It was better to err with the Spouse of Christ than to plunge with Luther into a headstrong course of opposition to her authority. Professor Schlottmann is certainly right when he declines to attribute the isolation of Erasmus to a selfish timidity. 'I am ready,' he once wrote, 'to be a martyr for Christ, but I will not be a martyr for Luther.' In point of fact his latter days would have been easier if he had joined the Lutheran party. To an English Churchman the steady refusal of Erasmus to commit schism in the interests of reform is one of the chief glories of his life; and that this was his real attitude the volume before us supplies abundant evidence.

It remains to say that Professor Schlottmann's Latinity is both perspicuous and elegant. We fear, however, that he has been ill advised in employing a dead language as the exponent of modern life and thought. The second chapter has already appeared in a German translation; and we hope that when the work is complete, the whole may be made accessible to readers who will be compelled to regard the present volume as a sealed book.

Beiträge zur Christologie. Von F. L. Steinmeyer. I. Die Epiphanien im Leben des Herrn; II. Die Theophanien im Leben des Herrn; III. Die Christophanien des Verherrlichten. (Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1880-2.)

HAD this book been written in a better style it would have been one which must infallibly have commanded a good deal of attention for its originality and thoughtfulness. But the writer seems to be one of those people who accept and act upon the Napoleonic dictum that language was given us to conceal our thoughts; and with the exception of Sanskrit there is no language which adapts itself to the concealment of thought so well as the German. It has been a difficult task to read and appreciate the polyglot style of our author. We have still another fault to find. In a book of this kind quotations are necessary and of the greatest value. But out of consideration to the readers the references should be added. Of these, unfortunately, there are very few.

When we come to the subject-matter of the book we come to a great deal that is helpful and suggestive. Only, like many other suggestive and helpful books, it must (especially in its first part) be handled with carefulness. It seems occasionally to come dangerously near to heresy, and although the author generally steers clear of false doctrine, yet in less skilful and less scrupulous hands the speculations he indulges in might prove very subversive of orthodox faith. The book professes to throw fresh light upon the nature and work of our Saviour, and to vindicate His Divinity against the criticisms of the modern school of rationalizing divines. It seems to us a misfortune that in these speculations the author should set aside the great assistance which he might obtain from the Catholic Church and her doctrines, and always refer to 'die Kirkliche Theologie' with

an almost undisguised contempt. On points such as these we should all be at one ; we are all fighting on the same side.

The book has appeared in three separate parts, each by the consideration of a triplet of events in the Sacred life bringing out some particular point in our Lord's life. The first part treats of the 'Epiphanies in the Life of the Lord.' There is something strange in our author's use of the word *ἐπιφάνεια*. He states that the Feast of the Epiphany was originally a heretical or schismatic festival (he does not quote his authorities), but that the heretics used the word to denote that at certain epochs in our Lord's life He received from His Father certain gifts and graces which He did not possess before ; and that the Catholic festival, to counteract the schismatic one, strove to bring out the true meaning of the Epiphanies as we have received them. Our author takes the Epiphany in its unorthodox sense, and strives to show that there were periods in the Lord's life in which He received from His Father certain fresh revelations, or, if not fresh, then fuller, revelations of His Father's will.

Herr Steinmeyer finds fault with most modern and ancient commentators, that in treating of the baptism they neglect the baptism for the consideration of the descent of the Holy Spirit and the voice from heaven. These, he says, are but accessories ; the important fact for the Lord Himself was the baptism itself—for as the waters of Jordan closed over His head He was, as it were, baptized into His own death, and the 'Epiphany' of the baptism was the light which was given Him as to His career as the Messiah : He had to 'become obedient unto death.' Till that period our Lord had been without a knowledge of the direction of His life. He had not known, for instance, the precise character of the enemy against whom He would have to fight, nor the particular methods of attack which that enemy would adopt. These were revealed to Him in the Temptation, which was (as Bengel rightly calls it) *omnium tentationum epitome*. And finally, when just before the last great battle of the Passion the flesh might possibly have asserted itself against the spirit, then to strengthen Him for His last great effort, the *βραβεῖον*, the prize, was set before Him and the glories of His mediatorial kingdom were set before Him on the Mount of the Transfiguration.

Such are the 'Epiphanies' which form the first portion of Herr Steinmeyer's work. They are suggestively treated, but the author's views are incompatible with a belief in the true doctrine of the Incarnation.

The second part—the 'Theophanies'—is in some degree a corrective to the first. 'What think ye of Christ, *whose son is He?*' The answer to this question was one of the most difficult portions of our Saviour's teaching. The disciples began by saying one to another, 'We have found the Messiah ;' but with the exception of Nathanael they were a long time before they could say 'Thou art the Son of God.' The blind man is asked by his healer, *σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ*. His immediate question is, 'Who is He?' The crowds in Galilee are ready to own, after seeing the miracle of the loaves, that 'this is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the

wor
do g
to s
repl

His
'of
ther
are
The
thou
pecu
attri
the
Son
as re

Her
are a
gone
narr
bear
part
rema
final
the
clear
into

I
reser
Fath
as H
force
quot
ζηλο
show
(ὁ ὦν
cially
plann
His
omni
pity
omni
rated
to th
imme
Him
T
to th

world,' and to ask with amazement, 'When Christ cometh, can He do greater miracles than these?' But when that same Prophet begins to speak about His Father and to claim to be the Son of God the reply of the same hearers is, 'This is a hard saying, who can hear it?'

What steps, besides simple assertion, did Christ take to establish His sonship? It is the declaration of the Nicene Creed that the Son is 'of the same substance with the Father,' *consubstantialis patri*. He therefore possesses the same attributes as the Father. God's attributes are divided into two classes, the *κοινώνητα* and the *ἀκοινώνητα*. The first class are those which men can possess as well as God, though in a lesser degree. The second class are those which are peculiar to God. The sum of the second class is comprised in the attributes which are involved in the incommunicable name and in the Greek paraphrase which is also applied in the Revelation to the Son Himself, *ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, God in His Nature, God as revealed in History, God as the Sovereign Ruler.

What steps did Christ take to show His claim to this title? Herr Steinmeyer takes three instances to prove his point. They are all three of them actions in the recording of which S. John has gone out of his usual way to narrate facts which had already been narrated in the Synoptics; they are all actions of a peculiar nature, bearing traces of deliberate premeditation and preparation on the part of our Lord; all have a deep symbolic meaning, all from the remarks made by the spectators produced a deep impression; and finally all three were wrought at critical moments, the beginning, the middle, the end of the ministry. The three events are the cleansing of the temple, the walking on the waves, and the entry into Jerusalem.

In the first Christ sought to show His Sonship by establishing His resemblance to the Father in His Nature (as *ὁ ὢν*). 'Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise' is His indignant expression as He sees the desecration of the temple; and the prophecy which forced itself upon the minds of the disciples is not the one generally quoted by commentators, 'the Lord shall suddenly come,' but *ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου κατέφαγέ με*. Christ, like the Father, is *θεὸς ζῆλωτής*, 'of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.' Thus did Christ show Himself to be one with the Father in Nature. One in Nature (*ὁ ὢν*), but one also in historical manifestation (*ὁ ἦν*). This is especially shown by the walking on the waves, which was purposely planned to give to His disciples the true knowledge of Him in all His dealings with the sons of men. Like His Father, He shows His omniscience by 'seeing' them in the dark watches of the night; His pity by coming to them when they were 'toiling with rowing'; His omnipresence by surmounting the natural barrier of waves that separated Him from them; His omnipotence by bringing them at once to the haven where they would be. The lesson was not without immediate effect; 'they that were in the ship came and worshipped Him saying, of a truth Thou art the Son of God.' (S. Matt. xiv. 33.)

The triumphal entry into Jerusalem was a manifestation of Christ to the world as '*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*.' It pointed backwards to the entry of

Solomon into Jerusalem (1 Kings i. 33), and forwards to the kingly glories which will attend the *παρουσία* of the Son of Man. *εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου*, say the crowd, and, with still deeper significance *εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου* (S. Mark xi. 10.) Christ, as his Father, is *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, the sovereign ready to assert His sovereignty when the 'Kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.'

Such were the Theophanies, the manifestations of the Son of God, which took place during the Sacred Life. But Christ's work was not finished with the Passion, nor even with the Resurrection and the Ascension. There was still needing for the strengthening of the faithful the proof that He had entered into His glory, and that that glory was one *μέλλουσα ἀποκαλυφθῆναι* waiting for its manifestation.

The Christophanies, the manifestations of the glorified Christ, form the subject of the third part of the book before us. They are three in number: the vision of S. Stephen, the conversion of S. Paul, and the Apocalypse of S. John, the object of all three being to impress upon Christian believers the imperative duty of seeking those things which are above, *where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God*.

In the hour of the Church's earliest and probably most terrible persecution, the glorified Saviour was seen standing at the right hand of God. This was not, as Neander would allow, merely a prophetic insight into the future triumphs of Christianity, but a real vision of heavenly things accorded to the moribund martyr. It was received as such by the crowd of tormentors, it served to increase their rage and fury as they see on his countenance the traces of the glory revealed. Not, however, for S. Stephen, but for the Church's sake, was the vision revealed. The brunt of the persecution was to fall, not on him that was called away to his rest, but on those that remained. For them, therefore, the vision was intended. The Church in her hour of sorrow, when all her members were scattered abroad, was to 'seek those things which are above,' where Christ, the real object of the persecution, was *standing*, not so much in readiness to assist, as *standing unmoved* and unhurt amongst the blows showered on Him by His adversaries. The vision of S. Stephen was designed to give the Church confidence as to the ultimate result of her conflict with the world.

In the conversion of S. Paul we have not merely the fact that from being faithless he had become believing; we must remember that S. Paul's whole apostleship dates from this period. 'Am I not an apostle? have I not seen the Lord?' he says. It is true the Church of Antioch set him apart; but the inspired words which moved the Church to do this seem to refer to the former calling. 'Separate me Paul and Barnabas to the work for which *I have called them*.' He was essentially, as he declares of himself, 'an apostle, not of men nor by men, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.'

And as his commission, so was his message, *οὐ δύναιμι ἂ εἶδον καὶ ἤκουσα μὴ λαλεῖν*. He conferred not with flesh and blood: it is

no hu
And
autho
Chris
answ
anima
Apos
road
the c
the g
Chris

'T
davit
streng
Churc
will p
meet
which
see th

W
to S.
the A
ment
have
death
the e
We h
except
in the
a boo
and h
been
Iησοῦ
revela
Hims
Giver
under
the ha
are,'
Churc
exhort
victory

W
analys
the gr
count
But it
these
it does
but th

no human wisdom that he claims to deliver, it is a God-sent one. And in the delivery of this message he is responsible to no human authority—he cares not for man's judgment, he appeals to God and Christ to establish the truth of his words, and to God alone is he answerable. And throughout the whole of his life one great thought animates the Apostle—the *faithfulness of Him that called him to the Apostolate*. If then the true meaning of the vision of Jesus on the road to Damascus be not so much the conversion of a persecutor as the calling of an Apostle and the concomitant endowing of him with the grace of perseverance, we can see the meaning that this Christophany has for the Church:—

'The Church has passed through sad periods, has seemed *ὡρεῖ ἵσον θανάτῳ*; the preaching of Paul has called to life the all but dead, and strengthened the enfeebled ones. The last evil days stand before the Church: the preaching of Jesus, *as Paul delivers it* (Acts xix. 13-15), will preserve and perfect her, so that as a *παρθένος ἀγνή* she may go to meet her Lord. That midday hour near Damascus is the hour upon which this view depends. There is the king of the realm, there we may see the might of his sceptre.'

We now come to the last of the Christophanies, the one accorded to S. John. We have to notice here, first, the recipient, the last of the Apostles to whom the gift came, we might almost say, as a fulfilment of the quasi-promise, 'If I will that He tarry till I come.' We have next to consider the time of its communication, the eve of the death of S. John, just before the apostolate was to disappear from the earth, and during the period of the persecution of Domitian. We have then the gift itself, truly a *δωρεὰ ἀνεκδιήγητος*, a book which, except to reverent and holy minds, is simply unintelligible, and which in the hours of the Church's prosperity has ever been very unpopular; a book, moreover, which the Church admitted to the sacred canon, and has retained there, in spite of the fact that criticism has mostly been against it. We have then the subject of the book—*ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*—not a revelation of the righteousness of God, nor yet a revelation of the wrath of God, but a revelation of Jesus Christ Himself in the glory of His mediatorial kingdom. And, lastly, the Giver brings His own gift. 'It is the fundamental condition for the understanding of the Apocalypse that we must take this *δωρεὰ* out of the hands of the *ἐρχόμενος*.' And the gift comprises 'the things that are,' and 'the things that must be hereafter,' the condition of the Church on earth, and the condition of the Church hereafter: the exhortation to the 'patience of the saints, now—the promise of victory hereafter to him that overcometh.'

We have striven, as far as we were able, to give our readers an analysis of Herr Steinmeyer's new work. It has defects, although the gravely erroneous teaching on the nature of our Lord is partly counterbalanced and corrected by the teaching of the later volumes. But it has also very considerable merits, and not the least among these is that it does not attempt too much, but what it does attempt it does well. It only treats of nine facts connected with our Saviour, but these nine facts it treats so fully and so thoughtfully that it can

justly claim to have fulfilled its author's intention when he set himself to work to write not a complete Christology, but only a few helps to the better understanding of that most difficult but important study.

Christian Ethics. Special Part. Second Division: Social Ethics.

By Dr. H. MARTENSEN, Bishop of Seeland. Translated from the Author's German Edition. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.)

SOCIAL ethics are understood and studied amongst us, we imagine, in but a fragmentary and imperfect way. This is to be attributed partly to a tendency in the English mind to decide questions empirically and *ad hoc*, as they arise; partly, we suspect, to that general suspicion under which the science of casuistry has fallen amongst us, which has caused its study to be almost wholly neglected. This is due, of course, to the abuse of it by the Jesuits, and to their doctrine of Probabilism; and it cannot, we fear, but be admitted that a habit of over-refining leads by degrees to tampering with the laws of right and wrong. Bishop Sanderson was the last great English casuist; and since it is evident that every conscientious person must practise casuistry in some form occasionally, it would be well that this should be done with a conscience to some extent instructed. The clergy might do worse than peruse with some care the treatises of the learned author above mentioned—*De Obligatione Conscientiæ* or *De Framento*—or the various collections of 'cases of conscience,' published at various times. One of these was republished by the late Dr. Whewell many years ago; and another by Bishop Sanderson's present learned successor in the See of Lincoln.

The work before us, though it can scarcely be called a treatise on Casuistry, yet aims at affording guidance to the individual in his capacity as a husband or parent, as a master or servant, as a citizen and man of business, a politician, or an artist. The non-formal way in which it is written does not hinder its being full of the most valuable and useful instruction upon such points as these; and the study of it could not fail to afford instruction to almost any reader. It is a drawback that its determinations of 'cases of conscience' (for that is what each of them really is) should appear to be empirically arrived at, and to rest upon no exactly stated principles; but with all this it is able, high-toned, pious, and sensible; and we are able fully to recommend it.

The Church and the Ministry: a Review of the Rev. E. Hatch's Bampton Lectures. By the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A. Second Edition. (London: Rivingtons, 1882.)

MANY of our readers are doubtless aware that a review of Mr. Hatch's *Bampton Lectures*, which appeared in our number for July 1881, has been published in a developed form by its author, Mr. Gore, the Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon College, under the title of *The Church and the Ministry: a Review of the Rev. E. Hatch's Bampton Lectures* (Rivingtons). In the preface to the second edition of his Lectures Mr. Hatch bestows some notice on Mr. Gore's

criticisms; and the second edition of *The Church and the Ministry*, now lying before us, contains a rejoinder. 'Mr. Gore remarks that 'Mr. Hatch has not thought it worth while to reply to his historical challenges.' These were certainly broad enough. Could Mr. Hatch prove 'that Church membership was not at first an essential of Christian life'? Could he 'justify the assumption that abuses protested against by sub-apostolic or later ecclesiastical writers were survivals of earlier, and presumably purer, forms of Christianity'? Could he produce any 'positive evidence that the Christian ministry was, as such, the creation of economic expediency; that the primary functions of the bishops were secular and financial; or that the spiritual conceptions of the Eucharist sprang out of the associations of a mere supper for mutual support and charity'? Mr. Hatch in his new preface represents Mr. Gore as having simply shown that if a person will start with the 'Augustinian theory' of the Church, he can represent the facts of early Church history in accordance with it. But, not to dwell on the unfair assumption implied in the appellation 'Augustinian,' Mr. Hatch himself appears to start with a preconception, the roots of which go deeper than may be apparent to cursory readers of his book. They are traceable, we believe, to a certain way of reading and estimating those very New Testament documents which in his Lectures he declined to discuss. This omission was naturally complained of. The *Guardian* of November 2, 1881, in reviewing his book, says, 'To dismiss summarily the whole of the New Testament statements respecting the institution and characteristics of the Christian ministry seems to us a most audacious proceeding, and one which really vitiates any conclusions which the clever author may reach out of the mutilated evidence which he has left himself.' Mr. Gore also 'challenged Mr. Hatch to show cause why he should have ignored, in his estimate of the evidence, the documents of the New Testament.' To *this* challenge Mr. Hatch makes a threefold reply: (1) that the New Testament passages relating to the ministry are theological rather than historical; (2) that Scripture requires Church history as its comment; (3) that the exegesis of the New Testament is encompassed with great difficulties. Similarly, in a letter to the *Guardian* of November 9, 1881, he had referred to 'the preliminary questions of authenticity and date, and the main questions of exegesis and harmony,' adding that he 'had for years been engaged in making somewhat elaborate investigations' on this subject 'with a view to publishing their results.' The first two answers are obviously evasive; the real question is, What light does e.g. S. Paul's 'theological' language as to the Church and the ministry throw on the early history of these institutions; and is the comment to be studied before the text? The third answer hints at broadly negative conclusions as to New Testament documents; and this, we suspect, is the root of the matter. But let that pass. What is now, by means of the new preface, clearer than before is this, that Mr. Hatch's whole view of post-apostolic evidence on his subject is determined by his conviction that the visible Church, as it existed in the apostolic age, and, of course, as it has existed ever since, is *not*

really of Divine institution, is *not* 'Christ's body,' is *not* a society which He has chartered and endowed; that it has nothing about it specially sacred or supernatural; that it is a community which grew up and organized itself under natural laws of providence, not under any unique operation of grace. Of course, a naturalistic view of the Apostolic Church necessitates a naturalistic view of its post-apostolic manifestation. Those who blithely accept the latter as a deliverance from 'hierarchical' or 'sacerdotal' pretensions will gradually be led on to accept the former, in order that their theory, in a familiar Arnoldian phrase, may 'stand upon four legs.' And when they have got thus far, some further questions, which Mr. Hatch leaves on one side, will encounter them. 'What about the original relation of the Apostles to their Master? Did *they* receive any special Divine commission? Need we retain that idea within the area of the Gospel history, after we have banished it from the area of the Church? Are we, indeed, justified in doing so until a number of difficulties as to the authenticity, harmony, and exegesis of the Four Gospels have been settled in a way favourable to ecclesiastical tradition? And if they should not be so settled, ought we to be unwilling to admit *here* also that "God acts in the realm of grace as He acts in the realm of nature, by the mediation of general and far-reaching laws, without any special interposition of that mysterious and extraordinary action of the Divine volition which, for want of a better term, we speak of as supernatural?"¹ Shall we not, by such an admission, be really completing our view of the uniformity of God's providential action, reconciling religion with philosophy by the sacrifice of the crude notion of "interference," and gaining a Christ who will be not less but more "Divine" to us when we see Him without the miraculous aureole, and hail in Him the richest development of man's moral nature under its general Divine education?' This will be said; will Mr. Hatch's followers be ready to gainsay it? His new preface, as Mr. Gore points out, will enable thoughtful readers to see more clearly 'the coherence of the authoritative ministry with the visible Church,' and, we will add, the solidarity of Christian supernaturalism. A 'ministry' which is not a ministry, but a mere staff of officials created by social convenience, implies a visible 'Church' which has nothing of the sacredness attaching to that august name, but is just as simply natural, in origin and essence, as a benefit club or a literary society; and such an idea of the Church will act on many minds as a solvent of belief in a miraculous Incarnation. This belief, seriously accepted and firmly held, must surely tell on a man's conception of that Christian body which comes before us in the New Testament; while the theory of naturalism, applied to that body, will not in the long run be content to dwell together with the supernaturalist conception of its Founder and its Head.

Mr. Gore might, we think, have advantageously enlarged this preface; it would have been well to test, not by reference, but by

¹ See Mr. Hatch's first and eighth Bampton Lectures in reference to 'the organization of the Church.'

extracts, the value of Mr. Hatch's quotation of Hooker's words : '*So far forth as the Church is the mystical body of Christ and His invisible spouse, it needeth no external polity*' (E. P. iii. 11. 14). Hooker gives the reason. 'That very part of the law Divine which teacheth faith and works of righteousness is sufficient for the Church of God in that respect. But,' he adds, 'as the Church is a visible society and body politic, laws of polity it cannot want' (cannot dispense with). Now, the sentence which we have italicized could only be of use to Mr. Hatch if Hooker held that the visible Church was a society of purely natural formation. Mr. Gore points out that Hooker held quite the opposite view ; although he restricted the term 'body mystical' to what he describes as the flock of which our Lord said that its members should not perish (iii. 1. 2), he yet applied the phrase 'one body' to the Church visible, adding, 'the unity of which visible body and Church of Christ consisteth in that uniformity, which all several persons thereunto belonging have, by reason of' the 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism.' Further on (iii. 1. 8) he uses the same phrase, 'the visible body and Church of Jesus Christ.' We are not now concerned with Hooker's contention that no one form of Church government is definitively prescribed by Scripture, although he adds that 'those things which are of principal weight in the very particular form of Church polity which we against them' (the Puritans) 'uphold are in the selfsame Scriptures contained' (iii. 4. 1), that Episcopacy 'best agreeth with the sacred Scripture' (iii. 11. 16), and that 'to the Apostles in the beginning, and to the Bishops always since, we find plainly both in Scripture and in all ecclesiastical records, other ministers of the Word and Sacraments have been subordinate' (iii. 11. 20). The point is, Did Hooker, or did he not, consider the visible Church to be, in the special, not general, sense, a Divine creation? We believe that Hooker would have been as much astonished at the negative proposition as S. Paul would have been by hearing that some readers of the Epistle to the Ephesians had imagined the 'one body' which was 'edified' through the ministry 'given' from above to be not more supernatural, *quâ* society, than a guild of woolcarders or of silversmiths. When Hooker is distinguishing things essential from things variable in Church polity, he plainly says that 'God's clergy are a state which hath been and will be, as long as there is a Church upon earth, necessary by the plain word of God Himself, a state whereunto the rest of God's people must be subject as touching things that appertain to their soul's health' (iii. 11. 20). Has Mr. Hatch, we ask, a moral right to claim Hooker? It is needless to refer to the chapter on the ministry in the fifth book.

We venture to commend Mr. Gore's pamphlet in its revised form to our readers' most attentive consideration.

Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland. By G. W. SPROTT, D.D. (Edinburgh and London : W. Blackwood and Sons, 1882.)

THIS is an important and noteworthy book. Proceeding from the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and consisting of

official 'lectures delivered at the Universities of Aberdeen, Glasgow, S. Andrew's, and Edinburgh,' by 'one of the lecturers on Pastoral Theology appointed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland,' its tone is surprisingly Catholic and ecclesiastical. The Eucharistic doctrine, for example, is high. 'The Lord's Supper' is the 'chief ordinance of the Church, in which, united with Christ in His work of intercession within the veil, we represent and plead before the Father His sacrifice once offered on the Cross, make a spiritual oblation of all possible praise for the same, and feed upon Him risen and glorified, and witness for Him before the world' (p. 99). The consecration of the elements is spoken of in Catholic language (pp. 119, 120). Its effect is to make what was 'bread merely' to be 'Christ's Sacramental Body' (p. 127)—'no common bread and wine, but sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ' (p. 122).¹ Again, he describes fasting Communion as 'almost as old as Christianity,' and has an obvious reverence for this and other Catholic practices, such as the use of the mixed chalice, of the prolonged survival of which among Scotch Presbyterians he gives us interesting notices (pp. 124, 242). Once more, his treatment of 'Sunday' is completely anti-Puritan in tone (pp. 175, 177, &c.), and the tendency of his whole book is in the direction of liturgical forms. He does, indeed, waive the question, as a disputed one, in his preface, but the tendency of the book is unmistakable. He feels the advantage of 'free prayer' where many Churchmen would agree with him (p. 175) and its astounding disadvantages in public ministrations. That a minister should make fancy additions to the formula of Baptism² (p. 74), and make any claim on the sponsor that he pleases, as, for example, 'that he should have family worship in his house regularly twice a day' (p. 68); that he should, *as part of his prayer*, give notice of the afternoon preacher and hour of the service (p. 49), and present the elements to the communicant with the phrase, '*I have much pleasure in putting into your hands*,' are among the almost incredible results here chronicled, to which the want of taste in ministers, unrestrained by fixed forms, has led in the public service. For the 'laying a foundation stone' Dr. Sprott actually supplies an office (p. 249), and we believe that he is among those ministers who, in their own churches, follow the course of the ecclesiastical seasons.

This book, then, is a remarkable phenomenon, and it cannot be taken alone. Dr. Sprott is one of a body of ministers of the Established Church, whose numbers we have no means of estimating, but of whose existence we have abundant evidence, who are working in a Catholic direction both in doctrine and practice.

Whither will this movement tend? At present Dr. Sprott's

¹ Dr. Sprott (p. 124, note 1), by a misuse of terms, speaks of doctrine similar to his own as '*Sacramentarianism*.' Historically this is taken to represent the opposite system. He means '*Sacramentalism*.'

² Dr. Sprott would lead us to believe the greatest carelessness in administering baptism, reaching the point of making it actually invalid, to have prevailed in the past (pp. 74-76).

position appears to one not surrounded by his difficulties one of singular inconsistency. He is 'halting between two opinions.' How can he adopt a line in the main Catholic and dismiss Confirmation in the slighting fashion he does (p. 84)? Surely a slight study of the theology of Confirmation in the Early Church¹ would convince him that it was regarded as the only appointed means of conveying the gift of the Holy Ghost to the baptized Christian. You cannot accept the Catholic Church and ignore Confirmation. Again, Dr. Sprott's treatment of the question of ordination is almost trifling with the subject. He seems to uphold three positions. First, that the Scotch Church maintains a Presbyterian succession—a position which must have received a rude shock when, in last June, the General Assembly determined, by a majority, we believe, of fifty-eight, to admit an Independent minister (one, that is, quite outside even of a Presbyterian succession) to the ranks of the Established Church clergy without reordination.

Next, Dr. Sprott maintains the position that a Presbyterian succession is adequate: a position in bold contradiction to the voice of the Catholic Church.

Thirdly, we have the astounding theory that the Scotch Presbyterian Church has as good an episcopal succession as 'the Southern Hierarchy' of the English Church! (p. 199). We must leave Dr. Sprott in the enjoyment of this last position, only remarking that, among other omissions, he does not seem to have realized that in the Catholic doctrine of ordination there is required not only 'matter' but 'form' for the Sacrament. So we leave Dr. Sprott in his ambiguous position, and shall watch with interest and hope the result of a Catholicizing movement side by side with the Rationalistic in the Scotch Establishment. We trust that the Church of Scotland, whose episcopal orders are beyond dispute, will show her true Catholicity and her reverence for the Presbyterate in such fashion as to help her Presbyterian brethren to see that to submit to the claims of the Episcopate is not to submit to mere 'prelacy.'

The Latin Prayer Book of Charles II., &c. By MESSRS. CHARLES and WILLIAM MARSHALL. (Oxford: Thornton, 1882.)

THIS expensive volume (in proportion to its size) is dedicated to the late Dean Stanley, because two of his predecessors at Westminster, Bishop Earle and Archbishop Dolben, were entrusted with the task (which they never performed) of translating the 'Revised Liturgy'—the Messrs. Marshall mean the whole Prayer Book—of 1661 into the Latin language; and because 'no one more highly values the Protestant principles, . . . and no one is more deeply sensible of the disastrous consequences of maiming the beauty of the most excellent religion in the world by sacerdotal errors and superstitions.' This last sentence gives the motive of the publication, the writers' competence for which may be estimated by the fact that they repeatedly (pp. 23-28) apply to the English Sovereign the title of

¹ See especially a tract by the Rev. F. Puller, *What is the Distinctive Grace of Confirmation?* (Rivington).

'Supreme Head' of the Church, in ignorance and forgetfulness of the important facts that, for the short period during which that title was insisted on, *i.e.* by Henry VIII., the Church only conceded it with the qualification, *quantum per Christi legem licet*, and that Elizabeth expressly repudiated it, and substituted the phrase Supreme Governour, which stands in the Declaration prefixed to the Articles.

Another reason given in the Preface is 'the remarkable scarcity' of the book itself, which doubtless is of some value and interest even at the present day. But surely common sense should have suggested, under these circumstances, the actual reprint, and not merely 'an account of' the book itself, the only part of which really given to us is the Catechism. This is reprinted with a translation, occupying, with the Messrs. Marshalls' 'collations, annotations, and appendices,' no less than 116 pages (83-198). Liturgical scholars would have gladly welcomed a reprint, without note or comment, of Dean Durel's Latin translation—and, indeed, of his French one also, published in 1662—and the cost need not have been much more than half that of the present volume.

Durel, who was a native of Jersey, had been a loyal adherent of Charles II., and was after the Restoration rewarded accordingly, being made, 1663-4, Prebendary of Salisbury, Windsor, and Durham, and having 'a rich donative' conferred upon him; while in 1677 he 'was made Dean of Windsor and of Wolverhampton, and was also presented to the valuable living of Witney.' It has a droll effect to read, within half a dozen lines of these announcements, that 'in religious principles Durel was what is called a "good Churchman," with hardly more sympathy for Dissent than for Papacy.' We can quite believe it. This doubly-decanal Dean had very solid reasons for being a 'good Churchman.' Our Editors are also at great pains to show that he was a 'High Churchman.' We are not anxious to claim him; but at any rate, he was more of a 'good Churchman' and of a 'High Churchman' than our Editors; for he was at least guiltless of calling Charles II. the 'Supreme Head of the Church of England.' We are treated on p. 27 to the astounding assertion that, after Durel had prepared his Latin translation of the Book of Common Prayer, he 'consistently and loyally, in a tone similar to that adopted by the last translators of the Bible, dedicated his work to the Sovereign of the Realm, the Supreme Head of the Church of England.' There are two inaccuracies here, to use a gentle term. The translators of 1611, in their dedication 'to the most high and mighty King James,' call him 'Defender of the Faith, &c.' There is not a syllable about 'supreme headship,' or any 'headship.' We suppose the powerful partizan magnifiers used by the Messrs. Marshall have discovered something lurking under the '&c.' which is invisible to ordinary eyesight. Of the second inaccuracy they, with admirable *naïveté*, convict themselves. For they give, p. 21, their own English translation of the Dedication to the King prefixed by Durel to his Latin Prayer Book of 1670. It is 'To the most serene and most mighty Monarch, Charles II., by the grace of God King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the

Faith.' Here, also, there is not a word about any headship, 'supreme' or other: not even an '&c.,' under which Erastian eyes could hope it might lurk. The account in part ii. chap. i. of the various editions of Durel's book and of other versions, earlier and later, Latin and Greek, will be useful to the student. Chap. ii. of part ii. is on the 'Meaning of the term "Priest"' and some words of 'Monsignor Capel,' to the effect that the Church of England has neither priest, altar, nor sacrifice, are quoted as 'a very accurate statement of the case.' Of course it is unfortunate, or worse, after this, that the word 'Priest' so often occurs in the Revised Prayer Book of 1662; but the Messrs. Marshall are much consoled by the fact that Durel renders it by 'presbyter' 'one hundred and sixty times in all,' and 'not once by the term "sacerdos."'

It would have been more satisfactory, to say the least, if the Messrs. Marshall had not suppressed all mention of the contrary facts of the Greek versions of Elias Petley, 1638, dedicated to Archbishop Laud, and Dean Duport, 1665, dedicated to Archbishop Sheldon. They include them in the account of the various versions given in their part ii. chap. ii., the really useful portion of their work; but they do not tell us that both these translators, while using in some places the terms *λειτουργός* and *πρεσβύτερος* where the English Prayer-Book has 'priest,' give in most places *ιερεύς* as its representative; and this especially in the Communion Office. Petley also, and this is very noticeable, has *ιερεύς* in the Rubric before the Special Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick. He does not translate the Ordinal; but Duport, in the decisive words accompanying the laying on of hands in the Ordination of Priests, has for 'the office and work of a priest' *τὴν λειτουργίαν καὶ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἱερέως*.

After this we are not surprised to find that part iii., the largest portion of the volume, consists chiefly of a laboured attempt to minimize the sacramental teaching of the Church Catechism, by means of long and wearisome digressions in the course of their very minute annotations on their reprint and translation of this portion of Durel's work. Pages are taken up in the futile endeavour to show that the word 'generally,' in the phrase 'generally necessary to salvation,' is used only in the modern sense, *i.e.* as meaning pointedly less than all. Of course, Baptismal Regeneration is denied, and indeed all distinctively Church teaching of any kind. Perhaps the climax is reached in the following passage (p. 105), which we cannot forbear quoting:—

'Dr. Harrison writes to us: "Our Nicene Creed is quite wrong on the doctrine of Baptism. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, recites an article from an earlier form of it as follows: 'I believe *in* one Baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins.' This is the obsolete Baptism of John, and not Christian Baptism. Cyril accordingly, in his exposition of this article, distinctly maintains that John's Baptism conveyed the remission of sins. Now John's Baptism was *for*, or in order to, repentance and conversion; and repentance was *for*, or in order to, remission. The error, when discovered, was only partially corrected by leaving out the words

'of repentance.' By this omission the Creed ceased to teach John's Baptism, but it was made to teach Christian Baptism as being for, or in order to, the remission of sins, which I am sure is neither the phraseology nor the doctrine of Scripture."

Athanasius contra mundum pales before 'Dr. Harrison' versus the Nicene Creed and the whole Catholic Church of the fourth century and onwards. Who 'Dr. Harrison' may be we are not told; nor why, after expressing himself thus, he should talk of 'Our Nicene Creed'; but the interests of theological learning, if not of common honesty and loyalty, compel us to regret that he is a clergyman of the Church of England, albeit our authors seem to appeal to him as an infallible authority.

Ad Clerum: A Synopsis of Moral and Ascetical Theology, with a Catalogue of Ancient and Modern Authorities arranged according to Centuries. By JAMES SKINNER, M.A., sometime Vicar of Newland, Great Malvern, and First Warden of the Beauchamp Charity; with a Prefatory Note by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, &c. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1882.)

IT awakens tender memories to criticize this volume. The originator of the scheme of which it forms a preliminary part, and the writer who was enabled to accomplish this portion, have both within the year passed to their last rest and their reward. Mr. O'Neill, of the Cowley Brotherhood, who urged upon us the importance of undertaking what many had long felt to be a crying need, and who gathered together a small company of priests, with Bishop Forbes as their chairman, to consult together about it, gave up his life as an offering to God for the conversion of India; and James Skinner, who, at the request of these friends, undertook to do what he could in furtherance of the scheme, during years of continual sickness and much suffering, has also been taken from us. Nearly all the work now published had received a last revision from Mr. Skinner's own hands; what remained required only a partial supervision, and this has with great care, as explained in a brief note, been supplied. The object of this work, the general position of the science of moral theology, and what is needed as a safeguard against error, is well stated in the Preface by Mr. Skinner. Mr. Carter's addition is but an explanation, given with much feeling, how the necessary completion of his friend's work has been effected.

There can be no doubt of the value of such a scheme as was projected, and of which this volume is the result. We have nothing of our own which at all meets it. There are indeed admirable works by English divines to which we can refer for guidance on questions of conscience, such as Jeremy Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, Bishop Sanderson's *Lectures on Conscience and Human Law*, and Butler's great moral treatises. But we have no scientific *Summa*, nothing which in the least degree attempts to embrace, in order and detail, the various departments included under the head of Moral Theology. Yet in proportion as the clergy are called to deal with souls, they necessarily feel the need of such assistance. We are left to study

such subjects and to find answers to such inquiries in writers outside our own communion. The *Synopsis* does not profess to do more than supply a digest, in order, of the several divisions and subdivisions under which fall the various questions of practical religion. It is in fact a skeleton map drawn in minute detail of the several portions of the field—a series of heads of subjects—which may form the groundwork on which treatises might hereafter be written, as writers arise with adequate learning and leisure to complete the intended scheme. Together with these heads of subjects are given the names of authors to be referred to on each detail. Their names are given at the foot of each page. The digest of heads of subjects is very full, very carefully done, and apparently, as far as it goes, complete. The authorities are of all ages—from the first to the last century of the Church's history. We say 'as far as it goes,' for we observe that the scheme commences with what relates to 'the soul of man,' and 'human conduct.' The nature and attributes of God, with which the great moral theologians of old commenced such treatises, are not dealt with. Later on we come to questions of 'Grace,' but this still only as relating to human conduct, or to the Sacraments. We observe, too, that the Church is not mentioned among the heads of subjects; and though there are but few points needing to be treated of under this head, still it appears to us to be an omission not to touch, for instance, upon the 'notes' of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. The subject is dealt with, as far as practical points are concerned, under the head of 'Order,' but not as a matter *per se*.

There is added at the end of this skeleton map of subject-heads a valuable catalogue of authorities, century by century, from the beginning down to our own day, including writers of all portions of the Church—Eastern, Latin, and English. We understand that among the author's papers were found certain notes, intended evidently to have been completed, giving his view of the comparative worth or bias of the different authorities quoted, so as to supply a *catalogue raisonné*, but they are only fragments, and not sufficiently matured for publication. The only help, therefore, that is given to guide the reader is the fact of the country, or the religious order, to which the authors belonged. What, however, Mr. Skinner's judgment was as to such casuistry as is identified with the name of Liguori, or the Probabilists, seems clearly shown by his references. He refers, for instance, to Liguori only on the one subject of Priest-Missioners. In a note to his Preface he specifies Gerbert, and Père Graveson, of the Sorbonne, as safeguards against perverted views of 'Probabilism;' and while allowing that his catalogue is 'far from being exhaustive,' he regrets that he has omitted certain other works that he names, as 'special safeguards against the evils of the modern Roman system of casuistry.'

We heartily recommend this volume as a valuable contribution to a most important part of theological study, and one which we hope may lead on to further efforts in the same direction. While it is interesting and instructive in itself, this digest will form a most use-

ful groundwork to any one who is able to undertake any special subject for general treatment.

Histoire Contemporaine de l'Eglise. Par M. l'Abbé GUILLAUME.
(Paris : Librairie Victor Lecoffre.)

IN this work the Abbé Guillaume has undertaken to tell the history of the Church since the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789. The fact that it is contained in a single volume, extending indeed to some eight hundred pages, is a sufficient indication that fulness of detail is hardly to be expected. But it is astonishing how much the Abbé has succeeded in squeezing into this space. His work is a masterpiece of compression. It is written of course from the modern Roman—that is to say, from the Ultramontane—point of view, but no space is wasted in theorizing or arguing. The facts are set before us, and left to tell their own story with the smallest possible amount of comment. And the result is that in a series of fifty-seven lectures, delivered, we presume, to the students at the *Grand Séminaire de Verdun*, there is set forth an outline not merely of the history of the Gallican Church, but of the whole Church in all the four quarters of of the globe; and we have no hesitation in saying that the work forms the most convenient handbook that we know on this subject. Looking on it as a manual for candidates for ordination, we have been a good deal struck with the excellence of its plan and arrangement, and cannot help thinking that something of the kind is much wanted among ourselves.

(1) If only our own clergy were taken through some such course as this previous to ordination it would tend more than anything else to break down the absurd popular notion that, just as secular history is supposed to end with the battle of Waterloo, so Church history came to a close in 1662. Most of our Anglican text-books end abruptly at this point, if indeed they are brought down so far; and the bishops' requirements for ordination, with scarcely an exception, are limited to 'the Reformation period' in English Church history. Hence, while everybody has some idea of the course of religious events in the sixteenth century and the early part of the seventeenth, the period from the Restoration down to the present day is to many a blank page. There is not space to point out the disastrous consequences of this notion, and the unfortunate divorce between the present and the past to which it gives rise. We can only call attention to the fact, and indicate how it is avoided in the Roman Communion by such a course of modern and contemporary history as that which now lies before us.

(2) Secondly, we notice its *comprehensive* character. Although not unnaturally the affairs of the Gallican Church are treated at the greatest length, yet (so far as we have observed) no country has any right to complain of neglect, while the movements of the Anglican Church, and even of Continental bodies outside the Roman Communion, are not forgotten. Herein surely lies a lesson for us. Our general ecclesiastical histories end with the Reformation; and, in spite of Professor Stubbs's continuation of Mosheim, people in general

seem scarcely to feel that the fortunes of the Church on the Continent ought to have a living interest and importance for them.

(3) Thirdly, a most remarkable feature is the prominence here given to the history of the missionary work of the Church. We find scattered throughout the volume sketches of the progress of missions in all parts of the world—in Persia, India, Corea, China, Japan, Thibet, in Abyssinia and Madagascar, in Australia, and in both North and South America. The narratives, as may be supposed, contain only the barest outline; but still the fact that the Church's work in all these outlying fields is systematically recorded and brought under the notice of candidates for ordination must tend to impress them with a lively sense of its reality and importance, and were the same sort of thing done among us we might have less cause to lament the apathy and ignorance on the subject of mission work which is so painfully noticeable at present.

In all these points the Abbé Guillaume's work has much to teach us. We cannot, however, conclude without cautioning our readers against taking their ideas of modern Anglican Church history from this volume. It seems as if it were almost an impossibility for foreigners to be accurate in their accounts of English affairs, and we suppose that it is peculiarly difficult for one who belongs to another Communion to follow out carefully the various religious questions that arise and movements that originate in our island. Still, if matters so notorious as the Gorham controversy and the Tractarian movement are touched upon at all, they ought to be treated with care, and absurd and random statements such as the following might at least have been avoided:—

'L'on vit en 1847 l'évêque anglican d'Exeter, obéissant à la sentence de tribunaux civils, signer la nomination du curé Gorham, qu'il avait d'abord repoussé comme socinien. Gorham niait la divinité de Jésus-Christ et la nécessité du baptême' (p. 431).

And again on p. 433:—

'Nous avons déjà vu qu'une partie des membres de l'université d'Oxford cherchaient à retremper la religion officielle dans les traditions et les pratiques des premiers siècles chrétiens. Ces aspirations se fortifièrent par l'opposition même que leur faisaient certains docteurs enclins au rationalisme. Les principaux chefs étaient Pusey, Vaughan, Thomas et Newman. A la fin de 1833 ils commencèrent à publier de petits *Traité*s populaires pour les temps actuels.'

This list of the Tractarians will come as a surprise to most readers. But it is easy to see that our good Abbé has seen asunder poor Mr. Vaughan Thomas, and made him into two separate persons. Mr. Mozley describes him as 'a much respected though rather grotesque specimen of the Oxford of that day,' and though it is true that he presided at the preliminary meeting to decide on the course to be taken with regard to Hampden's appointment as Regius Professor, yet we think that he would be considerably startled at finding himself credited with a share in the Tracts, and represented as not merely *one* but *two* of the leaders of the Oxford movement.

VOL. XV.—NO. XXX.

K K

Theologische Literaturzeitung. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich.)

THE later numbers of this periodical have not been quite as interesting as usual. There seems to be a dearth of new German books which can claim foreign interest.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature is the great interest which seems to be taken just now in the life and writings of S. Boniface. Four books have been reviewed in this periodical during the past year on this subject. Fischer's *Bonifatius der Apostel der Deutschen* (Leipzig: Weigel) was reviewed in January. In June we had a review of an academic dissertation *On the Chronology of the Epistles of Boniface*; and again, in October, we have reviews of two books: Buss' *Winnfrid Bonifacius*, edited by Professor v. Scherer (Graz, 1880), and Pfahler's *S. Bonifacius und seine Zeit* (Regensburg: Manz). The interest of all these books centres of course in the importance which attaches to the labours of S. Boniface. According to some authorities, of whom Ebrard would seem to be the chief, Boniface found in Germany a pre-existing Church of Irish or Scottish descent, which, while retaining its national peculiarities of government and organization, was thoroughly evangelical and orthodox. From such a standpoint S. Boniface can of course be regarded as nothing else but a meddler who in the interests of the papacy entered into other men's labours and disturbed the Church. The mass of evidence seems, however, to point the other way. The 'Iro-Scotic' Church on the Rhine was probably more or less tainted with heresy of one kind or another; and even had it been perfectly orthodox, its loose and unpractical organization could not possibly have succeeded in holding Germany for Christ. As with us, so with the Germans: it was needful for the Church to be brought under the Papacy. Under no other conditions could it then have flourished. On the other hand Boniface's outspoken denunciation of simony and worldliness at the Papal Court shows that his submission to the Papacy was by no means that blind and unquestioning submission which the modern Roman Church demands for her infallible Head.

We are not at all surprised to find that Drs. Westcott and Hort's edition of the New Testament should be very highly praised for its diligence and research; nor yet that the *Quarterly Reviewer's* attack upon both this work and the Revised Version should be condemned as thoroughly uncritical.

Pastor's *Kirchliche Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V.* (Freiburg: Herder) is not favourably reviewed in No. 12. It works upon the proposition that the Reformation was not doctrinal nor religious so much as political. The reviewer condemns this supposition as a false and an unscientific one, and yet it seems to us with our knowledge of the English Reformation that political considerations had a very great deal to do with the religious reform, and that had it been possible for these political considerations to be left wholly on one side the religious reformation might very possibly have been carried into effect without the division which all sensible Christians must deplore.

Professor Küchler's *Zur Freiheit des Gewissens* (Leipzig: Lehmann) is well reviewed, and seems to be a book which contributes good suggestions towards the solution of many difficult points in the relations of Church and State.

Recreations and Studies of a Country Clergyman of the Eighteenth Century. Being Selections from the Correspondence of the Rev. Thomas Twining, M.A., Translator of *Aristotle on Poetry*; sometime Rector of S. Mary's, Colchester; and formerly Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. (London: J. Murray, 1882.)

THIS work is at once the manifestation of a very commendable family feeling in one who is conscious of his obligation towards an ancestor, whose feeling is the old Roman one—*patriæ fumus igne alieno luculentior*—and the picture of a state of things now utterly and for ever passed away. Mr. Twining, the grand-uncle of the compiler of this volume, lived from 1735 to 1804, during that 'backwater' of our English Church history, when spiritual slumber deep as 'poppy or mandragora' was spread over the land. It is odd for the parish priest of to-day to look back upon a time when clerical duty was so modest in its demands as to allow of frequent travel, and devotion to favourite pursuits as well. Parish duty was, we imagine, mostly a mere routine, and all the *vivida vis* of the parson went into these other things. Hence the strange fact that, in the private correspondence of an exemplary clergyman, some of it with other clergymen, there is no mention of his parish or his work, but of almost all possible things besides. The letters are good specimens of the average epistolary style of that day, which is not in our opinion an agreeable one, with its affected playfulness and familiarity, alternated with passages of more than Johnsonian grandeur. Mr. Twining was perhaps peculiar in the opinion he expresses in one letter, that 'Swift's writings have [not] any one bad tendency,' and that Swift, whom he calls 'that capital man,' was not a misanthrope, but a great humourist, who only pretended to misanthropical ways. It is very characteristic of the period when the French Revolution was in full progress to find in these letters three country clergymen agreeing that 'there never can be any peace or quiet in the world till the word liberty is entirely abolished and expunged from all languages.' And Mr. Twining himself expresses the opinion 'I do really think that no word ever did mankind so much harm.' But he was evidently a clever, scholarly man, of a turn for dilettantism, fonder perhaps of play than of work, but amiable, estimable, and a gentleman; and we have no doubt that this generation will peruse the account of him with considerable interest.

The Jews of Barnow. Stories by KARL EMIL FRANZOS. Translated by M. W. MACDOWALL. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1882.)

IN these eight stories of Polish Jews a very attractive effort has been made to convey to Gentile readers a true description of Jewish life

in some of its saddest phases. *Ars est celare artem*. The author has instructed us while we have been absorbed in his pathetic pages; and we rise from their perusal with a fuller knowledge of strange customs and manners than we could have obtained by any number of dry treatises. Translations of the little volume have, we believe, now been made into all European tongues as well as Hebrew; and, if the proverb quoted by the editor be true, 'Every country has the Jews which it deserves,' the softened feelings which these touching stories will awake may help towards the solution of a very difficult problem; and Professor Goldwin Smith¹ may join with Dr. Adler in words of peace. 'The Shylock of Barnow' is a terrible story of sorrow and sin, and the hardening of a father's heart; and, with 'Baron Schmale,' 'Nameless Graves,' and parts of 'Chane,' exhibits the Jewish character in some very repulsive traits; while 'Two Saviours of the People,' 'The Child of Atonement,' and 'Esterka Regina' (Queen Esther) present it in some very noble points indeed. 'The Picture of Christ' is one of the most dramatic of the series, and will be the favourite of many readers; but, for ourselves, the story of the poor little Chazan (or Reader), who saved his townsmen by the wonderful pathos of his singing, must be preferred. Its companion tale is too horrible; the second 'Saviour of the People' had better have been left to oblivion, for the dark shadow of her sacrifice can only tell us what we already know—'how much the wretched dare.'

Altogether, we commend the book, and hope it may have as great a success in England as it has received already on the Continent. Few who take it in hand will fail to thank both author and translator for their excellent work.

The Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages. By W. J. TOWNSEND.
(London: Hodder and Stoughton.)

THIS is an interesting work, and contains much information on a period in the history of thought about which very little is popularly known. Mr. Townsend is happy in having discovered a real literary want, and his book certainly goes far to fill a very considerable gap in our knowledge. Look into the Middle Ages where we will, scholasticism meets us at every turn—in the Church, the laws, even in poetry itself. Some account of the philosophical development of this great movement and of the principal thinkers belonging to it is certain to be read and carefully considered. While taking each of the chief schoolmen separately, Mr. Townsend gives us a short summary of their peculiar opinions, beginning with Scotus Erigena and ending with Gerson. It is of course very difficult, in writing on a theme somewhat dry and abstruse, to avoid over-diffuseness on the one hand, and on the other to give a sufficient general view of the subject-matter. We wish, however, that the author had found room to trace more fully the rise of scholasticism in that dark period which lies between Scotus Erigena and the Fathers, and had made it con-

¹ Vide *The Nineteenth Century* for Nov. 1882, 'The Jews: A Deferred Rejoinder.'

sistent with the title of his book to pursue his inquiries a little further than Gerson.

Against his biographical mode of treatment—good as it is in itself—it may perhaps be urged that rather too much space is given to incidents in the lives of men who are after all more famous for what they thought than for what they did, to the necessary exclusion of much which would be new to most of us. It is also somewhat difficult to take up again the various threads of thought which are dropped for a time, as each new actor is introduced upon the scene. It is certainly a wise choice which has selected Scotus Erigena as the first great schoolman; for he contains some indications of all the different phases of opinion about to be developed, and it is very truly said—‘He was the greatest intellectual force of the ninth century; but though he was a bold and adventurous mind he did not manifest thorough originality in his thinking.’ Mr. Townsend has, however, a little failed in making us feel what must have been the great charm of the *De Divisione Natura*, the immense scope and completeness of the theory—the orderly arrangement of the thoughts—to keep pace with the mighty procession of all things passing out from God and returning to Him. As that great train sweeps on before the mystic (for a mystic Scotus was as well as philosopher or logician), the barbarous Latin seems to creak and groan with the desire of expressing something it cannot contain, and a general impression is experienced, such as is in general only given by great writers, of a reserve of energy beyond what the words express. The aim after universality also, which is so visible in the *De Divisione*, and which pervades all scholasticism, is little dwelt upon, although it is one of the most conspicuous signs of that age; and has not Mr. Townsend gone a little beyond the mark in describing Scotus Erigena as a Protestant born out of due time? If this title is to be given to every one who applied reason to the elucidation of doctrine, has not S. Augustine an equal claim, or indeed most of the heretics in every place and time? There is also an inclination to follow too slavishly those French writers who see in every exercise of the intellect on religious matters ‘the revolt of reason against authority.’ Some truth there is no doubt in this view of things, but is it not more accurate to say that it was the Church herself who in the first place preserved the remnants of ancient learning to be employed for her own purposes, not doubting but that the *vera ratio* and *vera religio* were not only contrary but identical? Christians remembered that the pagan philosophy had been vanquished, and had very little reason for supposing that it would be able to do more in the future than in the past. Such ideas, if entertained, were certainly to a great extent justified by events. Twice the Church gathered her doctrines together, once in the *Liber Sententiarum* of Peter the Lombard, and, finally, in the *Summa* of S. Thomas, silencing all objectors, much more by arguments which appeared unanswerable than by the mere power of authority.

Passing by an interesting sketch of S. Anselm in which Descartes’ well-known argument for the existence of God is traced to

its real originator, and a notice of Abelard in which rather too much is made of his *sic et non* as rationalistic work, it is satisfactory to find that the mystics, represented by Hugh of S. Victor, are not forgotten as a part of the scholastic whole.

It is rather curious that Roger Bacon, the 'Doctor Admirabilis,' finds no place among his compeers. He, as truly as the mystics, may claim to be more than half a schoolman, and had his own opinions on the subject of universals; indeed it would be curious matter of inquiry to endeavour to find out how far in his attempts at experimentation he was tied down by the deductive method of the time, which is known to have influenced the physicians and alchemists to such an extraordinary extent. Dante, too, was thoroughly imbued with the scholastic philosophy. He reproduced many of the doctrines of S. Thomas Aquinas, whom he chiefly followed, *con angelica voce in sua favella*. His elaborate representation of Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory, shows the vast outlines of a *Summa*, glorified into poetry, and scholasticism finds at last that poetical expression which is wanting, we are told, to no science. All this is very pertinent to the subject, and it is to be regretted that Mr. Townsend's space was necessarily too limited to enable him to touch upon any but the more immediate facts.

The two most interesting chapters in the book are, we think, those upon Duns Scotus and Ockham, the great nominalist, who in reality gave the death-blow to scholasticism and is much more of a modern in many of his ideas than any of his contemporaries. Our author successfully traces many thoughts, supposed to have originated much later, back to these two men; in particular Locke's principle that all knowledge is derived through the double medium of sense and reflection, which Scotus announced even in a more correct manner than Locke himself.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, CHARGES, SERMONS,
AND PAMPHLETS.

The Treasury of David. By C. H. Spurgeon. Vol. vi. Psalm cxix. to cxxiv. (London: Passmore and Alabaster, 1882.) All students of the Psalter will welcome Mr. Spurgeon's new volume, although they will often disagree with him. The special value of the book is the use which the author has made of a host of commentators and critics whom a Churchman would be most unlikely to consult.

The Good News in Africa (Seeley, 1882), by a well-known authoress, with a preface by her brother, the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, is well written and interesting, and copiously illustrated. We do not complain of the friendly notice of the various sectarian missions given in this volume, but the omission of the Central Africa Universities Mission in particular is unjustifiable.

Mrs. Oliphant has given so many proofs of the interest which she feels in the conditions of the future life that her hand will be recognized in *A Little Pilgrim in the Unseen* (London: Macmillan, 1882),

now published in a collected form. It deserves to be read with sympathy. But we do not feel that any really valuable new thought is suggested on this most mysterious but fascinating subject, and we regret that this pleasing little volume is pervaded by a dangerous undercurrent of Universalism.

Messrs. Rivington continue the publication of their dainty little volumes compiled by Mrs. Sidney Lear. *Sunrise, Noon, and Sunset* are the titles of the three now before us. They are made up of charmingly suggestive extracts. A series of five tiny volumes—*The Christian Year*, *The Imitation of Christ* (translated by the Rev. W. H. Hutchings), *The Spiritual Combat* (by the same translator), *The Devout Life* (by S. Francis de Sales), and *The Hidden Life of the Soul* (translated from the French of Jean Nicolas Grou)—have been issued by the same publishers. And the example has been followed by Messrs. Griffith and Farran, who publish *Whispers of Love and Wisdom*, collected by Annie Cazenove and furnished with a preface by Miss Yonge.

From many attractive books published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge we may name Lord Nelson's *Readings for the Seasons* as one that would be found useful not only in private devotion but in family prayer. Dr. Bright has issued *Private Prayers for a Week* (Parker and Co.), which is especially valuable for its collects.

The Teacher's Prayer Book (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode) is an interleaved Prayer Book, on the model of the well-known edition of Dr. Campion and Mr. Beamont, with annotations by Dr. Barry. It is likely to be very useful both to teachers and to students. The notes are eminently judicious and sometimes too colourless for our taste—as, for example, about the Ornaments Rubric. It is pleasant to find Dr. Barry speaking boldly in defence of the Table of Kindred and Affinity. He takes the only right ground in affirming that our Lord's own teaching 'puts affinity or connection by marriage on exactly the same footing as kindred or connection by blood.' And he adds, 'It will be seen that the table is constructed on broad and obvious principles, and that if these be infringed in any case there is no reason why the infringement should not be indefinitely extended.' We may take this opportunity of mentioning that a powerful 'Marriage Law Defence Union' has been founded. Its office is No. 20 Cockspur Street, and its secretary is Mr. G. J. Murray.

Among new editions may be mentioned a beautifully illustrated volume in quarto form containing all the *Sacred Allegories* (Rivingtons) of the late Rev. W. Adams; and a third edition of Bishop Moberly's most valuable Bampton Lectures of 1868, *The Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ* (Parker and Co.). The preface to the second edition appears without alteration or addition. *Early Influences* (Rivingtons, 1883) appears, still anonymously, in a new edition, with a preface, calling attention to the real value of this almost forgotten book, from the pen of Mrs. Gladstone. A cheaper edition, in a condensed form and in one volume, of the *Life of Bishop Gray*, of Cape Town (Rivingtons, 1883), will be widely acceptable.

It is sufficient to announce the publication of the *eleventh* edition of Mr. M. H. Bloxam's well-known treatise on ecclesiastical vestments under the somewhat ill-chosen title of *Companion to the Principles of Gothic Architecture* (London : Bell and Sons, 1882).

The Charge of the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles (Edinburgh : S. Giles's Printing Company) deals only with questions of local interest, but concludes with an earnest appeal for assistance to the Western Highlands Mission Fund. The Archdeacon of Lewes has published three instructive *Addresses* (Brighton : Treacher) on questions now before Parliament and Convocation and on the Revised Version of the New Testament, which he delivered at his fifth Visitation.

Alms and Oblations (London : Stock), by Canon Simmons, has a permanent value. This eminent liturgical scholar refutes his adversary, Dean Howson, of Chester, who had striven to show that the word 'oblations' in the Prayer for the Church Militant is not intended to include the sacred elements. It was an easy task, but it has been done thoroughly and as few could have done it. This pamphlet has been reprinted with additions from the *Churchman* monthly magazine.

The Hon. C. L. Wood has acted wisely in publishing the timely and spirited paper which he read at the Church Congress at Derby on the Communion Service of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., with the Service itself appended. It bears the title of *Liturgical Improvement* (London : Church Union Office). The injudicious and intemperate outcry with which this paper was received will result, as usual, in making the Service itself much more widely known and valued. Mr. Wood quotes on his title-page the well-known words of Bishop Wilson, in the *Sacra Privata*, expressing his hope and prayer that this office may be restored to us. We may mention here that Mr. James Parker has edited, and published, as a companion to his shilling edition of the *First Prayer Book*, a reprint of the *Second Prayer Book* of 1552 (Oxford and London, 1883).

Among single sermons we would mention as particularly good one by Dr. Kingdon, Coadjutor Bishop of Fredericton, called *Spiritual Famine* (S. John, N.B., 1882) ; and one of special interest and of most encouraging hopefulness by the Bishop of Ely on the opening of Selwyn College, Cambridge, called *The Strength of the Church* (Cambridge : Macmillan and Bowes, 1882). Mr. Alleyne Pearson has published a vigorous and sensible sermon on *Christian Temperance* (Canterbury : Goulden), protesting against the extremes to which many total abstainers have been driven. We may notice also with commendation Dr. Luckock's sermon, entitled *An Appeal to the Church* (Rivingtons), preached before the University of Cambridge on Commencement Sunday. Its burthen is an eloquent and well-timed remonstrance against the withdrawal of the clergy from University training. The preacher urges that times of equal peril brought out Redmayn, Overall, and Pearson ; and hopes that it may again be said, as it was of the divines of their day, 'Anglicanus clerus stupor mundi.'

INDEX TO VOLUME XV.

ABE

- A**BERYSTWITH, the University College at, 46; its object, 59
 Abstinence from certain foods from wrong motives, condemned, 458 *sqq.*
 Acacius, the question about his heterodoxy, 81 *sqq.*, 91
 Adler, Rev. Dr., on the use of fermented wine at the Passover, 454
 Agapetus, Pope, his negotiations with Justinian, 102 *sqq.*; his political mission to Constantinople, 106 *sq.*; his death, 107
 Aldrich, Dr., Dean of Christ Church, Prolocutor of Lower House of Convocation (Queen Anne), 27
 Alexander, Rev. W. L., on Deuteronomy, 473
 Anastatius II., Pope, his letter to the Emperor on Acacius, 80; consents to hold communion with Photinus, 81; his death, *ib.*; the feeling against him in the Roman Church, 82
 Anastatius, the Emperor, fostered Eutychianism, 87 *sq.*; submits to the demands of Vitalian, 89; his letters to Pope Hormisdas, 89, 91, 93; arrests Bishops of Illyricum, 92; arrests Papal legates, *ib.*; his death, 93
 Anderson, Mr. J., *Early Christian Remains in Scotland*, reviewed, 291-300
 Anglican Communion out of England, the, 469 *sqq.*
 Ants, their habits, &c. 110-127; their storage of grain, 115 *sqq.*; some ants are true farmers, 117; English ants, 117; social orga-

BAR

- nization, 118; their wonderful instinct, 119; stages of ant life, 119 *sq.*; slave-making ants, 121 *sqq.*; division of labour, 125; power of recognition and intercommunication, *ib.*
 Ant-hills, their great size in warm climates, 114
 Appeal to the Crown, what cases it was intended for, 180 *sq.*
 Aquinas, S. Thomas, on the wine of the Eucharist, 460 *sqq.*
 Arnold, Dr., his teaching and its results, 400 *sqq.*
 Atterbury, his action in regard to Convocation in 1702, 25 *sqq.*; his book on the Parliamentary status of the Lower House of Convocation, 26; his correspondence with Bishop Trelawny, 26 *sqq.*; his Charge to Archdeaconry of Totnes, 26 *sq.*; the claims of his party, 27; the concessions of the Bishops rejected, 28; his party refer the dispute to the arbitration of the Crown, 31; he continues the strife in 1703 and 1704, 34 *sqq.*; he is promised the Chancellorship of Exeter Cathedral, *ib.*; is nominated Dean of Carlisle and Canon of Exeter, 37; his action on the question of the Archbishop's prorogation of Convocation (1706), 43
BANGOR, Dean of, on the social condition of Wales, 51 *sqq.*; on supposed prejudices against Dissenters in Welsh schools, 56
 Barbados, retirement of the Bishop of, 469; his successor, *ib.*

BAR

- Baronius, his account of the question of Acacius, 81
 Basil, S., on marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 421
 Bedford, Bishop of, on the wine of the Eucharist, 432, 466
 Betts, Mr. J. T., his *Seventeen Opuscles of Juan de Valdés*, 247
 Binkes, Dr., Dean of Lichfield, nominated Prolocutor by Lower House of Convocation (1704), 38; pronounced contumacious, and submits, 45
 Bishops and Presbyters, their action in Convocation in the reign of Anne, 25; Address of Presbyters to the Crown sent back from Upper House, 27; Bishops offer concessions to Lower House, *ib.*; various phases of the contest, 32 *sqq.*
 Blue Ribbon Army, the, 467
 Blunt, Rev. J. H., *The Reformation of the Church of England*, 241
 Boniface II., Pope, his election confirmed through the death of the Anti-Pope Dioscorus, 100; is compelled to revoke his nomination of his own successor, *ib.*; confesses himself guilty of high treason, *ib.*; his death, 101
 Bree, Rev. Herbert, appointed Bishop of Barbados, 469
British Magazine, the, its share in the Church revival, 145
 Burgess, Bishop, his scholarships at S. David's College, 61
 Burnet, Bishop, on the claims of the Lower House of Convocation, 27; on the feelings of the clergy towards Queen Anne, 41; on the intermediate sessions of the Lower House, 43 *note*
 Bute, Marquess of, his edition of the *Altus* of S. Columba, 229

CAMPELLO, Count, his religious position in Rome, 472
 Canada, position of the Church in, 470 *sq.*
 Canons of interpretation of the Levitical law on marriage, 411
 Canning, Mr., anecdote of, respecting S. David's College 6

CON

- Carlyle, T., his *Life and Reminiscences*, 301 *sqq.*; estimate of his life and character, 306 *sqq.*; Mrs. Carlyle's influence on him, 318 *sq.*; his works, 320; his literary style, 321 *sqq.*; his political creed, 328 *sq.*; his religious teaching, 332 *sqq.*
 Central Council of Church Conference, the, 216
 Chinese address presented to the Bishop of Guiana, 471
 Christian Catholic Church in Switzerland, its present position, 472
 Church, the, in 1882, 212-216
 Church and State, discrepancy between, in the matter of Divorce, 175 *sqq.*
 Church Congress, the meeting at Derby, 216
 Church in South Africa, its position in regard to the Church of England, 170
 Church of England Temperance Society, 430 *sqq.*
 Clark, Dr. Andrew, on alcohol, 438
 Clemance, Dr., on Deuteronomy, 473
 Close, Dean, death of, 469
 Cœlius Symmachus, dispute about his election to the Papacy settled by a Synod, 82 *sq.*; impeachment of, before Theodoric, 84; is tried before Italian Bishops, 84; remonstrance of the Churches of Gaul, 85; gain of the Papacy through his trial, 86; charged with selling holy orders, 87; memorial sent to, by Syrian Catholics, *ib.*; his death, 89
 Convocation, under Queen Anne, 24 *sqq.*; Atterbury's position in regard to, 26 *sq.*; Dean Aldrich chosen as Prolocutor of Lower House (1702), 27; Bishop Burnet on the claims of the Lower House, *ib.*; House of Commons sides with the Lower House, 28; 'intermediate sessions' held by Lower House, 33; the strife continued in 1703-4-5, 34 *sqq.*; prorogation by the Archbishop (1706), 42; long suspension of sessions, *ib.*; the position of the Scotch Church in the contem-

CON

- plated Union, *ib.*; Convocation not consulted on Scotch Union, *ib.*
 Convocation (under William III.) decided by the Judges (1702) to have expired with the vacancy of the Crown, 25
 Convocational strife (1702, &c.), boldness of the Lower House in cases of, 25 *sqq.*; weaker action of the Bishops, *ib.*
 Cook, Canon, on the Revised Version of the first three Gospels, 127-139

DALE, Mr. A. W., *The Synod of Elvira*, 237

- Dalhousie, Earl of, on marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 412
 Dangers of extreme opinions on total abstinence, 466 *sqq.*
 Deane, Rev. W. J., his edition of the *Book of Wisdom*, 217 *sq.*
 Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, its career in Parliament, 426 *sq.*; social arguments against, 424, 427 *sqq.*
 Denison, Archdeacon, sketched by Mr. Mozley, 168; anecdote of, 169
 Differences about Convocational rights, the, in 1702, 25 *sqq.*
 Dorner, Dr. J. A., *A System of Christian Doctrine*, 246
 Dorotheus of Thessalonica, publicly tears up Hormisdas's Formulary, 97; his merely nominal punishment, *ib.*
 Drake, Dr., his *Memorial of the Church of England*, 40 *sq.*
 Drunkenness in Wales, 71 *sqq.*
Drysorfa, Welsh periodical, on chapel-building in Wales, 64
Drywygiwr, Welsh periodical, on the 'sleepy condition' of Dissent in Wales, 69; on immorality in Wales, 73

EASTERN and Western Christianity, relations between, in sixth century, 86 *sqq.*; Eastern Catholic revolt, headed by Vitalian, 88 *sqq.*; doctrinal disputes, 101 *sqq.*

GRA

- Ecclesiastical Law in England, its elements, 171; its basis, 172 *sqq.*; contrasted with that of Established Church of Scotland, 181
 'Ecclesiological Movement,' the, 159 *sqq.*
 Edersheim, Dr., on the wine of the Paschal cups, 452 *sq.*
 Ennodius, secretary of Pope Symmachus, 85; claims 'hereditary innocence' for the Popes, *ib.*
Ennodii, Magni Felicis, opera, ed. Hartel, 479
Enoch, Book of, 477
 Ephesus, the Council of, 267 *sq.*
 Eusebius' MSS. of the New Testament, the, 129 *sqq.*
 Exeter, Bishop of, on marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 429

FABER, Rev. F. W., notice of his career, 164 *sq.*

- Fauquier, Bishop, of Algoma, death of, 469
 Felix, Pope, nominated by Theodoric, 99; his death, *ib.*
 Formulary of Hormisdas, the, 92, 94, 96; its failure of good effect, 100
 Francis, Philip, his epigram to Edmund Burke on writing English, 22
 Franzos, K. E., *The Jews of Barnow*, 499
 Froude, Hurrell, his close connexion with Newman, 151; his influence, 152
 Froude, Mr. J. A., his *Life and Reminiscences* of Carlyle, reviewed, 301-343
 Funk, Dr., his *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*, 219

GIBSON'S *Synodus Anglicana*, referred to, 32

- Gore, Rev. C., his review of Mr. Hatch's *Bampton Lectures*, 486-489
 Graetz, Dr., his Commentary on the Psalms, 230 *sqq.*
 Grahamstown Case, the Judgment in the, criticized, 169-184

GRI

- Griffith, Rev. John, his 'Appeal to the Welsh Nation,' 50
 Guillaume, M. l'Abbé, his *Histoire Contemporaine de l'Eglise*, 496
 Gull, Sir W., on Intemperance, 438

HAMPDEN, Bishop, described by Mr. Mozley, 168

Hayman, Rev. Dr., on the fermented liquors of Holy Scripture, 446 *sq.*

'Hereditary innocence' claimed for the Popes, 85

Herodotus, his story of finding gold in Indian ant-hills, 113

High Church clergy in Queen Anne's reign, their treatment, 45

Hobart, Rev. W. Kirk, *The Medical Language of S. Luke*, 475

Holland, Rev. H. S., his sermons criticized, 1 *sqq.*; on the powers that be, 3 *sqq.*; on the two-sidedness of high Christian character, 6 *sqq.*; his employment of paradox, 8 *sqq.*; on the grounds of moral and religious conviction, 13 *sqq.*; old arguments and new ones, 17; our responsibilities for our convictions, 20; on what the action of reason depends, 20 *sqq.*; on the moral aspects of the Christian Creed, 22 *sqq.*

Holy Matrimony, Our Lord re-enacted the original law regarding, 406

Hooper, Dr., Dean of Canterbury, deserts Atterbury's party, 33

Hopkins, Canon, his work on Temperance and Total Abstinence, 435, 445, 453

Hormisda, Pope, succeeds Symmachus, 89; sends legates to Constantinople, *ib.*; his terms of peace with the Emperor, 90; his letter to the Antioch Catholics, 93; his second legation to the East, 92 *sq.*; text of his Formulary, 96; his negotiations with Justin I., 98; makes concessions, *ib.*; his death, *ib.*

Howley, Dr., Archbishop of Canterbury, addresses presented to him

KER

by the clergy and heads of families in 1834, 149

INTEMPERANCE, sometimes a physical as well as a moral evil, 465

JOHN I., Pope, succeeds Hormisda, 98; his negotiations with the Emperor Justin I., and with Theodoric, 98 *sqq.*; is imprisoned by Theodoric, 99; his death, *ib.*

John II., Pope, publishes an edict on bribery in Papal elections, 101; doctrinal dispute with Scythian monks, *ib.*; his letter to Justinian, 104; his death, *ib.*

Johnson, Dr. George, his *Harveian Oration*, 1882, 255

Joli, M. Henri, *Traité de Morale de Malebranche*, 250

Judicial Committee, the, as a Court of Final Appeal, 170 *sqq.*; the Bible not an authority with it, 172 *sqq.*, 178 *sq.*; Broderick and Fremantle's Collection of the Judgments of, 178; Bishop Tait's Preface to that work, *ib.*; the Committee's treatment of the doctrine of the Atonement, 179; changes necessary in the Court of Final Appeal, 181 *sqq.*

Justin I., the Emperor, desirous of peace with Rome, 93 *sq.*; his letters to Pope Hormisda, 94, 98; accepts the Formulary, 96; reasons for his ecclesiastical policy, 97 *sq.*; persecutes his Arian subjects, 98; his death, 99

Justin Martyr, on the use of the mixed chalice, 459

Justinian, nephew of Justin I., his letter to Pope Hormisda, 94, 98; his confession of faith, 102 *sqq.*

KEARY, Mr. C. F., *Outlines of Primitive Belief among the Indo-European Races*, 252

Keble, John, on the Levitical law on marriage, 418 *sq.*

Kerr, Dr. Norman, his work on

LAU

Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical, criticized, 433 *sqq.*

- L**AURENTIUS, elected to the Papacy in opposition to Symmachus, 82; yields to the adverse decision of a Synod, 83
- Laws of different European States on marriage with two sisters, 423 *sq.*
- Leonine policy, the, retraction of, in the sixth century, 80
- Lincoln, Bishop of, on marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 419 *sq.*
- Llandaff, death of the Bishop of, 469
- Lubbock, Sir John, his *Ants, Bees, and Wasps*, 113-126

- M**ALAN, Rev. S. C., *The Book of Adam and Eve*, 223 *sqq.*
- Mammon, the Church's action in regard to their repudiation of wine, 463
- Marriage with a deceased wife's sister, arguments for, criticized, 404-430
- Marriage Law Defence Union, 503
- Marriage Law Reform Association, 417, 420
- Marshall, Messrs. C. and W., *The Latin Prayer Book of Charles II.*, 491
- Martensen, Bishop of Seeland, his *Christian Ethics*, 486
- Medical opinion on alcohol, 438 *sq.*
- Merriman, Bishop, his death, 216, 469
- Mixed Chalice, plea for the general restoration of the, 466
- 'Moderates,' the, get the upper hand in Convocation (1706), 45
- Moggridge, Mr. J. T., *Harvesting Ants and Trap-door Spiders*, 116
- Mohammedan law, the, prohibits marriage with two sisters, 423
- Molesworth, Mr. W. Nassau, his *History of the Church of England from 1660*, 244
- Morris, Mr. Lewis, his article on

PAL

- Wales in *Contemporary Review*, 46, 52
- Morrison, Dr. J. his Commentary on S. Mark's Gospel, 235
- Mozley, Rev. T., his *Reminiscences of Oriol College and the Oxford Movement*, reviewed, 139-169
- N**ATURAL history, traces of very ancient study of, 110 *sqq.*
- Natural Religion*, reviewed, 184-212; the meaning of the title, 185 *sq.*; the author's treatment of the differences between religion and science, 188 *sqq.*; of 'God revealed in Nature,' 194 *sqq.*; of the supernatural, 198 *sqq.*; of the worship of humanity, 205; of the Religion of Nature, 206 *sqq.*; of Christianity, 210 *sqq.*
- Newman, J. H., Mr. Mozley's account of him, 147 *sqq.*; on Tract 90, 156 *sq.*; on the character of S. Cyril, 262 *sq.*; on the Incarnation, 278
- Nestorius, his treatment by S. Cyril, 265 *sqq.*; his teaching on the Incarnation, 279 *sqq.*
- New Books, &c., Notices of, 502
- O**BITUARY of Clergy, 216, 468 *sq.*
- Occasional Conformity Bill, 37 *sq.*
- Ogle, Dr., his *Harveian Oration*, 1880, 255
- Old Catholics, the, their present position, 471 *sq.*
- Oliphant, Mr. L., *Traits and Travesties*, 254
- Oosterzee, Dr. van, *The Theology of the New Testament*, 245
- Otto, Dr. von, his *Corpus Apologiarum Christianorum sæculi secundi*, 220
- P**ALMER, Mr., on the concessions (1828-9) to the Church's enemies, 143
- Palmer, Sir William, described by Mr. Mozley, 147

PAP

- Papacy, disputed elections to the, 82, 100
- Papal elections, regulations for, enacted by Odoacer, and by Theodoric, 83; disgraceful bribery and corruption practised at, 101
- Papal Monarchy in the Sixth Century, the, 77 *sqq.*
- Papal power, development of between sixth and eighth centuries, 78
- Parliament, Church measures in, 213 *sq.*; the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill in the Lords, 214; directions as to Petitions to Parliament, 215
- Passover, the wine used at the, 451 *sqq.*
- Pasteur, M., on the Infinite, 203
- Pennington, Rev. A. R., his *Epochs of the Papacy*, 239
- Petrine claims, how affected by the continuous bribery in Papal elections, 101; as to the settlement of doctrinal disputes, 101 *sqq.*
- Præmunientes* clause, the, 25, 35 *sq.*
- Presbyters in Convocation (under Anne) charged with impugning the Royal Supremacy, 24; their claim of independence for the Lower House rejected by the Bishops, 27; continuance of the strife, 28 *sqq.*; Report of the Committee of Grievances, 35; various claims of rights by, 36; their complaints renewed in 1704, 38; 'admonished' by the Bishops for holding an intermediate session, 39; protest against the admonition, *ib.*; refuse to agree to Bishops' Address to the Crown, 41; assume the status of a separate House, *ib.*; protest against Archbishop's prorogation, 43; their treatment of Queen Anne's second letter, 44 *sqq.*
- Prohibited degrees of kindred, memorial lines containing the, 415
- Public Worship Regulation Act, treatment of cases under, 177
- Pusey, Dr., his accession to the

ROY

- Oxford Movement, 151; his Preface to his son's edition of S. Cyril, 260 *sqq.*; sketch of his life, character, and work, 381-404
- Pusey, Mr., his *S. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria*, reviewed, 257-291; sketch of Mr. Pusey's life, 257 *sqq.*; his studies of S. Cyril's works, 259 *sq.*; his Scholia thereon, 282 *sqq.*; his version of the treatises, criticized, 287 *sqq.*; his Notes, 289 *sq.*

QUEEN ANNE, violent letter of, to the Presbyters in Convocation, 25; her Whig Ministry exasperated against High Churchmen, 25; addresses a letter to Convocation on the dissensions of the two Houses, 42; her second letter, how received by the Presbyters in Convocation, 44 *sqq.*

RANDALL, Archdeacon, death of, 469

Rawlinson, Rev. G., on Exodus, 473

- Reformation of Morals, Association for the, in Anglesey, 72; promoted by the late Rev. W. Trevor, *ib.*
- Renan, M., his epigram on the historian of a religion, 22
- Representation, the, of Lower House of Convocation, published (1704), 37
- Retrospect of 1882, the, 468-473
- Revised Version and its critics, the, summary of its assailers and defenders, 343 *sq.*; *résumé* of their arguments, 345-368
- Richard, Mr. H., his evidence before the Commission on Education in Wales, 63 *sqq.*; his lecture on 'Nonconformity in Wales,' 63, 66, 72 *sqq.*
- Roberts, Mr. Owen, on Welsh grammar schools, 57
- Rose, Archdeacon H. J., sketch of his character by Dr. Newman, 145 *sq.*
- Royal Commission on Education

SAS

in Wales, members of, 46; Report of, 47 *sqq.*

S ASAPH, Bishop of, on Welsh grammar schools, 57

S. Cyril, his services to Catholic Christianity, 26 *sq.*; Cardinal Newman on his character, 262 *sq.*; Cyril's treatment of Nestorius, 265 *sqq.*; his relations with the Imperial Court, 272; his use of the 'eulogiae,' 272 *sq.*; his demands on the Eastern prelates, 274 *sqq.*; his doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, 276 *sq.*; his *rationale* of the Holy Communion, 283; his teaching on the Incarnation, 283 *sq.*; his literary style, 286

S. David's College, the establishment of, 60; its comparative failure, 60 *sq.*

Sarum Breviary, *the*, edited by Procter and Wordsworth, 226 *sqq.*

Schlottmann, Prof., his *Erasmus Redivivus*, 480

Schodde, Rev. G. H., *The Book of Enoch*, 477

Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, 501
Scotch Church, the, its position in 1706, 42

Scudamore, Mr., on the wine of Holy Communion, 426 *sq.*

Seren Gomer, and other Welsh periodicals, on the influence of Welsh Dissent, 68 *sqq.*

Sewell, Mr. W., account of, by Mr. Mozley, 166

Severus of Antioch, his anti-Catholic cruelties, 93

Sharpe, Mr. S., his edition of *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 221

Short, Bishop, resignation of the see of Adelaide by, 469; his successor, 470

Skinner, Rev. J., *Ad Clerum*, 494

Sorley, Mr. W. K., *The Hulsean Dissertation for 1880*, 236

Sprott, Dr. G. W., *Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland*, 489

Steere, Bishop, death of, 469

Steinmeyer, F. L., his *Beiträge zur Christologie*, 481-486

TRA

Strachan, Rev. J. M., appointed Bishop of Rangoon, 469

Supreme Court of Appeal in Ecclesiastical Cases, the: its functions and present composition considered, 368-380

Sylvester, Pope, excites the Romans against the Goths, 107; invites Belisarius to take possession of Rome, *ib.*; Theodora's intrigues against him, 108; his death, 109

TABLE of prohibited degrees, formulated by Archbishop Parker, 422

Tait, Archbishop, notice of his death, 468; his successor, *ib.*

Tasmania, retirement of the Bishop of, 469

Tattam, Archdeacon, on the Wines of Scripture, 431, 439, 447

Temperance agencies, the work of, in Wales, 70 *sqq.*

Tenison, Archbishop, his scolding of the Lower House of Convocation (1705), 39 *sq.*; his treatment of the protest of Atterbury's party, 43

Tertullian, on the liquid used at the Agapæ, 459

Theodoric, the Ostrogoth, disputed Papal election referred to his arbitration, 82; submits the question to a Synod, *ib.*; gets regulations enacted for Papal elections, 83; as sole master of Italy, the Pope was his subject, 97; was practically independent of the Emperor, *ib.*; his relations with Justin I., 98 *sq.*; imprisons Pope John I. 99; nominates Felix as Pope, *ib.*; his death, *ib.*

Theologische Literaturzeitung, 498

'Theory of Conflate Readings, The,' treated by Canon Cook, 136 *sqq.*

Thomas, Rev. R., on Welsh grammar schools, 57

Tillemont, on S. Cyril, 271, 273

Townsend, W. J., *Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages*, 501

Tractarian Movement, the, estimate of, 158 *sq.*; its fruits in after days, 162 *sq.*

TRA

- Tracts for the Times, The*, 153
Traethodydd, Welsh periodical, on Welsh love of religious excitement, 62; on religious teaching in Wales, 69
 Trevor, Rev. J. W., on the Anglesey Association for Reformation of Morals, 72
Τρισσὰ καὶ τετρασσὰ, the meaning of these words as used by Eusebius, 130
 Twining, Rev. T., *Recreations and Studies of a Country Clergyman of the Eighteenth Century*, 499
 Tyndale, William, on marriage between relatives, 410

VICTORIS Episc. Vitensis Hist. Persecutionis Africanae Provinciae, 221

- Vigilius, Papal nuncio at Constantinople, 108; intrigues to obtain the Papacy, *ib.*; is made Pope, 109; his death, *ib.*
 Vincent, Rev. T., his scheme of the prohibited degrees, 415
 Vitalian, governor of Mœsia, leads a Catholic revolt against Constantinople, 88 *sq.*

WALES, little known to Englishmen, 45; intermediate and higher education, supposed want of, in, 46 *sq.*; Report of Commission on, 47 *sq.*; status of Dissent in, 48 *sqq.*; denomina-

WIS

- tional character of schools in, 50; social condition of, 51 *sqq.*; the endowed grammar schools in, 52 *sqq.*; elementary schools, 53; prejudices against the Church, 54 *sqq.*; Welsh objections to the grammar schools, 57; difficulties connected with difference of language, 58 *sq.*; the Welsh-speaking Welsh know little of England, 61; Welsh periodicals, 62; Nonconformists in a majority in Wales, 63; unworthy motives for chapel-building, 64; heavy debt on chapels, 65; social and moral condition of Wales, 66 *sqq.*; testimony thereon from Welsh sources, 69 *sq.*; Sunday schools, 70; the cause of temperance, 70 *sq.*; immorality, 72 *sq.*
 Wake, Dr., Dean of Exeter, opposes Atterbury, 32, 37
 Ward, Mr. W. G., notice of his career, 155
 Welsh periodicals, quotations from, 62, 64, 68 *sqq.*, 73
 Western Church, its additions to prohibited degrees, 421 *sq.*
 Western Highlands Mission, appeal of the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles on behalf of, 504
 Wilberforce, Henry, the immediate cause of his secession, 163 *sq.*
 Williams, Rev. B., on the Welsh language, 58 *sq.*
 Wiseman, Dr., his articles on the Donatists, 156

in,
sq. ;
ools,
the
jec-
ols,
with
sq. ;
now
elsh
ists
un-
ild-
els,
tion
ony
ces,
the
sq. ;

op-

his

rom,

s to

peal
the

liate

elsh

the